DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 738 UD 025 306

TITLE Education, Environment and Culture: The Quality of Life in the South. Cross-Cutting Issue Report No. 5.

INSTITUTION Southern Growth Policies Board, Research Triangle Park, N.C.

PUB DATE 86

NOTE 58p.; Commissioned by the 1986 Commission on the Future of the South. For a related document, see UD 025 305.

AVAILABLE FROM Southern Growth Policies Board, P.O. Box 12293, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709 ($3).

PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Economic Development; Educational Opportunities; *Environmental Influences; Environmental Standards; *Government Role; Land Use; *Quality of Life; Rural Population; Social Problems; *Socioeconomic Influences; *State Government

IDENTIFIERS *United States (South)

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the major findings of a 1986 interstate survey on Southern economic development and quality of life. An introduction suggests that the quality of life in the South today has three major roots: education, environment, and culture. Five major recommendations are presented: (1) states should devote far greater attention to a full range of water management actions; (2) waste management efforts remain inadequate and should be upgraded; (3) states should establish credible and professional state level departments of environmental management and improve environmental data gathering and management; (4) states should grant localities broad powers to manage growth and to raise revenues to meet costs generated by rapid growth, subject to strong state minimum standards; and (5) states should become more active in preserving important historic, cultural, and artistic resources. Nine appendices (the bulk of the report) present position papers on these themes: economic development in the South (education, equity, and the quality of life); Southern public opinion on the South's quality of life; the Southern environment and the quality of life; the decline of Southern rural life; competition for land in the South; the South's natural heritage; the climate of the arts in the South (forecast for 1986-1992); environmental quality in the South; and environment and growth. (KH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

1-5-87

1986 Commission on the Future of the South

ED279738

Cross-Cutting Issue Report No. 5

Education, Environment and Culture: The Quality of Life in the South

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Janet Papke
SGPB

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Southern Growth Policies Board

UD 025 306

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Southern Growth Policies Board

The Southern Growth Policies Board is a public, interstate agency governed and supported by the state and local governments of the southern United States and Puerto Rico. It represents a regional commitment to excellence, a cooperative effort to develop, conserve, and put to best use the South's natural and human resources. In order to enhance the region's decision-making processes, the Board assembles objective information and makes recommendations regarding economic development opportunities in the South.

Board membership consists of five persons from each member state: the governor; a state senator and state representative appointed by the heads of their respective legislative houses; and two leading citizens appointed by the governor. Members include Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Other states eligible to join are Delaware, Maryland, Missouri, Texas, and West Virginia. The territory of the Virgin Islands is also eligible.

SGPB Leadership (1985-86)

Chairman: Governor Bill Clinton (Arkansas)
Chairman-elect: Governor Martha Layne Collins (Kentucky)
Vice-Chairman: Representative Ed Murray (Tennessee)
Treasurer: Mr. Joseph B. Martin (North Carolina)
Secretary: Dr. Jesse L. White, Jr.

Alabama: Governor George Wallace, Sen. Bill Smith, Rep. Bobby Junkins, Malcolm Portera, J. Garrick Hardy.

Arkansas: Governor Bill Clinton, Sen. Paul Benham, Rep. Lloyd McCuiston, Jr., Wooten Epes, Melvin Bell.

Florida: Governor Bob Graham, Sen. George Stuart, Rep. James Ward, Sylvan Meyer, Blucher Lines.

Georgia: Governor Joe Frank Harris, (Senate appointment pending), Rep. Eleanor Richardson, Robert Spratlin, Linda Beth Loughlin.

Kentucky: Governor Martha Layne Collins, Sen. Fred Bradley, Rep. Donald Blandford, Charles Hultman, Harry Snyder.

Louisiana: Governor Edwin Edwards, Sen. Samuel Nunez, Jr., Rep. Mary Landrieu, Laurie Glassell, John Laborde.

Mississippi: Governor William Allain, Sen. Ollie Mohamed, Rep. Will G. Poindexter, Steven Patterson, Sylvia Jackson.

North Carolina: Governor James B. Martin, Sen. William Staton, Rep. Daniel Lilley, Joseph B. Martin, A.P. Perkinson, Jr.

Oklahoma: Governor George Nigh, Sen. John Dahl, Rep. Guy Davis, Robert Sellers, James Leake.

Puerto Rico: Governor Rafael Hernandez-Colon, Sen. Gilberto Rivera Ortiz, Rep. Jose Granados-Navedos.

South Carolina: Governor Richard Riley, Sen. James Waddell, Jr., Rep. Jennings McAbee, John J. Dodds, James Burwell.

Tennessee: Governor Lamar Alexander, Sen. Joe Haynes, Rep. Ed Murray, Mitchell Thorp, Jack B. Morris.

Virginia: Governor Gerald Baliles, Sen. Hunter Andrews, Delegate Owen Pickett, Arthur Sandler, Susan Williams.

THE 1986 COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF THE SOUTH

EDUCATION, ENVIRONMENT, AND CULTURE: THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE SOUTH

Dr. George B. Tindall
Kenan Professor of History
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill

with testimony submitted by:
Dr. Albert E. Cowdrey
Dr. Pete Daniel
Mr. C. H. Dean
Ms. Sharon Donahue
Dr. David R. Goldfield
Dr. Robert G. Healy
Mr. Joseph Jacob
Mr. James M. Price
Dr. John S. Reed

SOUTHERN GROWTH POLICIES BOARD

The Honorable Bill Clinton
Governor of Arkansas
Chairman, Southern Growth Policies Board

The Honorable William F. Winter
Chairman, 1986 Commission on the Future of the South

Dr. Jesse L. White, Jr.
Executive Director, Southern Growth Policies Board

EDITOR'S NOTE:

This report was commissioned by the 1986 Commission on the Future of the South as an analysis of a critical cross-cutting issue facing the South in the next six years. Opinions expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect official policy adopted by either the 1986 Commission on the Future of the South or the Southern Growth Policies Board.

Jesse L. White, Jr.
Executive Director
Southern Growth Policies Board

The 1986 Commission on the Future of the South

Chairman: **The Honorable William F. Winter,** former governor of Mississippi, currently practices law in Jackson.

Members:

Dr. Robert L. Albright, President, Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte, North Carolina.
Ms. Josephine E. Ayers, President, Partnerships, Inc., Anniston, Alabama.
Mr. George L. Bragg, Chairman, CEO and President of Telex Computer Products, Inc., Tulsa, Oklahoma.
The Honorable George Busbee, former governor of Georgia, currently practices law in Atlanta.
Dr. Bettye Caldwell, Donaghey Distinguished Professor of Education, Center for Child Development and Education, University of Arkansas at Little Rock.
The Honorable Betsy L. Cochrane, Minority Leader of the N.C. House of Representatives, Advance, North Carolina.
Mr. J. Mac Holladay, Director, South Carolina Development Board, Columbia, South Carolina.
Dr. Frederick Humphries, President, Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, Florida.
The Honorable Jon Mills, Majority Leader and Speaker-Elect (1987-88), Florida House of Representatives, Tallahassee, Florida.
Mr. James R. Moffett, Chairman of the Board and CEO, Freeport-McMoRan, Inc., New Orleans, Louisiana.
Mr. Charles Morgan, CEO and Chairman of the Board, CCX Network, Inc., Conway, Arkansas.
The Honorable Charles Robb, former governor of Virginia, currently practices law in Washington, D.C.
Mr. Irby C. Simpkins, Jr., Publisher, THE NASHVILLE BANNER, Nashville, Tennessee.
The Honorable William B. Spong, Jr., former U.S. Senator from Virginia, currently a professor at the Law School at William and Mary.
Mr. Mike P. Sturdivant, President, Mike P. Sturdivant Plantation, Glendora, Mississippi.
Ms. Sheila Tschinkel, Senior Vice President and Director of Research, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta.
Dr. James H. Ward, Dean and Professor of Social Work, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.
The Honorable Wilson W. Wyatt, Sr., former lieutenant governor of Kentucky and mayor of Louisville, currently practices law in Louisville.
Ms. Harriet Zimmerman, National vice-chairwoman of United Jewish Appeal, Atlanta, Georgia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHARGE TO THE COMMISSION	4
THE 1986 COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF THE SOUTH	5
PREFACE	6
INTRODUCTION	7
QUALITY OF LIFE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	7
EDUCATION	8
ENVIRONMENT	8
CULTURE	11
CONCLUSION	11
RECOMMENDATIONS	12
APPENDICES	
A. Economic Development in the South: Education, Equity, and the Quality of Life	13
B. Southern Public Opinion on the South's Quality of Life	18
C. The Southern Environment and the Quality of Life	25
D. The Decline of Southern Rural Life	31
E. Competition for Land in the South	37
F. The South's Natural Heritage	43
G. The Climate of the Arts in the South *Forecast: 1986-1992*	47
H. Environmental Quality in the South	51
I. Environment and Growth	55

Charge to the Board in Establishing the 1986 Commission on the Future of the South

Governor Bill Clinton, Arkansas
Chairman, Southern Growth Policies Board
(1985-86)

The opportunity in 1986 to be a part of the Commission on the Future of the South is especially important to me, because my state will be 150 years old this year. For most of that 150 years we have been like much of the South: rural, poor, and proud...always seeking elusive dreams and wanting something we knew we deserved and never have quite been able to achieve.

As we take this unique opportunity to look at the future of our region moving toward the 21st Century, I think we should ask ourselves some very searching questions. Can the South at long last achieve a standard of living that is equal to or beyond that enjoyed by the rest of this country? Can we at long last have the range of educational and economic opportunities that our people certainly deserve and clearly need? Can we do it in every state, in rural as well as urban areas, for blacks as well as for whites? How can we maintain an almost laser-like concentration on the education reform issue for at least a decade?

I am optimistic. I believe that the kinds of economic and structural changes which have occurred may make it possible for us as a people to achieve for the very first time the economic status that the character and values and strength of our communities and our people merit. But, I am also mindful of the fact that our optimism may be founded more on faith than light, as it has so often been in the history of the South. I hope that this Commission report can be very specific in identifying the things that we have to do if we are going to answer those questions. And I hope it will be the kind of report that we can implement in the years ahead.

One thing is paramount. None of our states can ever be where we hope they will if we have an increasing percentage of people living below the poverty line and no constructive response to it. If we have learned anything in the South better than the rest of the country, it is that we are going up or down together as a people. Because of our history and because of the progress we have already made, we should take upon ourselves the commitment to prove that our country can achieve excellence with equity. I am absolutely convinced that it can be done and it ought to be done in the South, better than and before any other region.

And, finally, let me say that we should never forget why we are doing this. I go back to Hot Springs, Arkansas, twenty-three years ago, when as a boy of seventeen I happened to hear Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. make his "I Have a Dream" speech on television. I will never forget one thing he said that now means more to me than anything else. He said that he hoped one day his four little children would be judged not by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. I would like to see the people who live in my state and in my region be judged by the content of their character, but it will never happen until every child, by dint of his or her effort, can get a decent education and a decent, nationally competitive set of economic opportunities. And that is why we ought to do our best to chart the future of the South in 1986.

Excerpted from Governor Bill Clinton's inaugural address as Chairman of the Southern Growth Policies Board, June 1985, Atlanta, Georgia.

The 1986 Commission on the Future of the South

> The specific goal of the 1986 Commission on the Future of the South is to produce "a short, readable report to the people of the South which can be used by governors, legislators, and other leaders to mobilize support for those public policies and public-private partnerships which will increase the per capita income, reduce poverty, and reduce unemployment for Southerners by 1992."
>
> *Arkansas Governor Bill Clinton*
> *Chairman, Southern Growth Policies Board*

The interstate compact agreement which established the Southern Growth Policies Board in 1971 calls for the Board to prepare a Statement of Regional Objectives every six years. This Statement is intended to recommend strategies for approaching regional problems and may also identify projects deemed to be of regional significance. The process that has emerged for identifying these objectives has become known as the Commission on the Future of the South.

The first Commission convened in 1974 under Georgia Governor Jimmy Carter's chairmanship; the second in 1980 under South Carolina Governor Richard Riley's. This year's Chairman of the Board, Arkansas Governor Bill Clinton, followed their example in appointing a blue-ribbon panel of twenty southern leaders from the public sector, business world, and universities. Former Mississippi Governor William F. Winter was selected to serve as Chairman of the Commission.

The formidable task before the 1986 Commission has been to address the challenge set forth by Governor Clinton, cited above. In the words of Governor Winter, "the heart of the problem has been to find a solution to the dilemma of two Souths which are rapidly growing farther apart. One is represented by the popular image of the modern Sunbelt. But there remains that other South, largely rural, undereducated, underproductive, and underpaid that threatens to become a permanent shadow of distress."

The full Commission held its organizational meeting in Atlanta in January 1986. At its next meeting in March, Governor Winter appointed three working committees on topics identified as critical to the progress of the region: Human Resource Development; Technology and Innovation; and Government Structure and Fiscal Capacity. The committees decided to seek information about the region's problems and opportunities via public hearings across the South. During the spring, the committees held seven public hearings, taking testimony from 77 expert witnesses and receiving written testimony—including commissioned papers—from many others. Each committee distributed a synopsis of the information it accumulated and the issues it identified to all Commission members.

The full Commission assembled again in May in Atlanta to hear reports concerning five "cross-cutting themes" whose impact upon southern economic development would be considered in all Commission deliberations. These themes included concerns about equity, the internationalization of the southern economy, disparities in the economic progress of urban and rural areas, capital and infrastructure issues, and quality of life. Consultants prepared written reports about each of these cross-cutting issues. In addition, they contacted hundreds of individual Southerners and groups to gather information for their reports.

Upon the conclusion of the public hearings, each committee drafted a report which outlined its findings and recommendations. The three committee reports and five cross-cutting reports were presented at the fourth meeting of the full Commission in September at the Graylyn Conference Center in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. Through a series of lengthy roundtable discussions, the Commission crafted the ten strategic objectives which are presented in the final Commission report.

The final report of the 1986 Commission on the Future of the South was presented in November to the full Board of Directors of the Southern Growth Policies Board at its 14th Annual Meeting in Little Rock, Arkansas.

PREFACE

Economic development is not an end in itself, but a means to better lives for Southerners in rural and urban areas, of both sexes, and of every age and color. For this reason, the 1986 Commission on the Future of the South chose the topic of quality of life as one of its five cross-cutting themes. Without getting bogged down in definitions, the Commission sought to discover important ingredients which make the South the region that it is, how to hold on to those ingredients that we treasure, and how to tear down barriers to better lives.

The Commission called on Dr. George B. Tindall, Kenan Professor of History at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, to provide insights into what Southerners value and what resources the region can draw on to create the best quality of life. Dr. Tindall solicited ideas from a number of historians, sociologists, conservationists, and others working with quality of life concerns. This report is a compendium of views, but reaches surprising consensus: that the South ought to devote more effort to education, the environment, and traditional arts and culture in order to improve Southerners' lives.

The papers and consultations were supported as part of a grant from the Ford Foundation to the Southern Growth Policies Board. This generous support allowed the Commission to incorporate its cross-cutting themes, including quality of life, in every aspect of its work.

INTRODUCTION

What is economic growth for if not to improve the quality of people's lives?

Measuring the quality of life has been something of a minor industry in the social sciences for some time. It may entail objective measures of incomes, housing, medical care, and the like, or subjective measures of what people say about the quality of their lives. Demands for definition might best be met, however, by citing Greene's Law, as propounded by Johns Hopkins historian Jack Greene: "The more susceptible to proof, the more trivial the question."

Quality of life is not a trivial question. It is not easily subject to measurement, ultimately not subject to measurement at all. It means certain things for the members of the Commission on the Future of the South. It surely means something else for people working part time at minimum wage without health coverage or other benefits, an all-too-common phenomenon.

The Commission, therefore, ought not be paralyzed by questions of measurement and definition. No economy is ever fine-tuned enough to make such measurements anyway. Quality of life is less a point of definition than a point of procedure, something to attend to whatever the topic under discussion. Otherwise, the term itself becomes a stumbling block. The Commission considers it a cornerstone instead.

In 1986, the South marks two important anniversaries: a centennial and a bicentennial which signify the birthdates of both the New South and the Old South. December 22, 1986 is the centennial of the day on which Henry Grady, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, delivered his classic speech on "The New South." Grady's speech became the most celebrated expression of the New South Creed which held that the region's deliverance from its plight after the Civil War was to industrialize like the North. The New South Creed has been one of the formative influences on every Southerner, whether or not that Southerner ever heard of Grady.

But if we go back yet another hundred years, to 1786, we come to the year when cotton was first grown commercially on the sea islands of Georgia. Seven years later, in 1793, Eli Whitney's cotton gin made profitable the cultivation of the upland variety of cotton, which rapidly engulfed the Deep South. Cotton commerce in the Old South was dependent upon an expanding market in Europe, chiefly Britain; the first southern economic development boom thus had its roots in international trade. Those markets leveled off in the mid-nineteenth century, leaving the region locked into a cotton complex that held millions in bondage to poverty and ignorance.

The factory-hunting long touted as the salvation of the New South may have been less than the total answer to that poverty. Some of it, in fact, became little more than a formula for a different kind of poverty. Some areas of the South have suffered the experience described by the North Carolina Fund: "We have seen North Carolina shift from a poor agricultural state to a poor industrial state. We have experienced industrialization without development."

There is a widespread conviction that the region has reached a new crossroads, much as it had both one hundred and two hundred years ago, and that international economics are once again a driving force. The New South industrial jobs are migrating out of the country, just as the Old South cotton fields migrated out of the region. Workers in the Old South grew cotton; those in the New South milled it. Workers in the future South will need to be sophisticated enough to import it, develop new uses for it, or design and repair the technology that processes it.

QUALITY OF LIFE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

There will of necessity be trade-offs, but growth and excellence need not be set at odds with each other. The Southern Growth Policies Board itself grew out of a suggestion former North Carolina Governor Terry Sanford made in 1971 that by interstate compact the southern states set up an agency to help "avoid repeating the mistakes of the North in a southern setting." It is striking that the very situation he suggested the Board be set up to avoid has overtaken many of us since the Board's creation. "Too many cities have grown to be irreversibly unmanageable accumulations of too many people," Sanford said. "We need to find for the South, while there is yet time, some workable plan that will have the effect of directing the location of population centers. . . . Please note carefully that I do not mean that we are going to have to tell people where to live. But right now forces not directed by anyone tell us where to live. I would have us bring those forces under our own control."

We must guard against having quality of life concerns perceived as being hostile to economic progress. Quite the contrary is likely to be true. It seems apparent that investing public money in education, training and scientific research—in short, in upgrading human capabilities—is basic to an improved quality of life. It seems apparent, too, that attractive communities can be magnets for the kind of growth we would most want to encourage, for professionals and skilled workers are most likely to be drawn to communities in which they and their families can have educational, recreational, and cultural opportunities in a clean, safe environment.

According to urban historian David Goldfield (see Appendix C), the transition away from agriculture, 1940-1965, was followed by a period of consolidation, in which the metropolitan South seemed to jump from village to suburb. In the 1980's we have reached an era of competition, where the South must build on its strengths in order to grow.

Goldfield and sociologist John Reed (see Appendix B) note that one of the more remarkable aspects of these transformations has been the retention of southern traditions and culture: deeply-held religious beliefs, a strong sense of past and place, and attitudes toward pace of life, leisure, and "room to stretch out," among others. It is to the South's advantage that these attributes have become more important to Americans, especially as they have diminished in other regions. Working to maintain these attributes enhances rather than detracts from the region's economic position.

The Commission testimony suggests that the quality of life in the South today has three major roots: education, environment, and culture.

EDUCATION

Education is a basic prerequisite now to both quality of life and economic growth. As John Kenneth Galbraith said, no truly educated people is ever poor. In the emerging economy of what David Goldfield has called the Brain Belt, education and economic growth seem to reinforce each other more and more. As Tennessee Governor Lamar Alexander has noted, "If 90 percent of the people have a high school education in Minneapolis and 67 percent do in Tennessee, we're not going to be able to keep up, much less catch up."

The battle will be long and difficult because of the South's lengthy tradition of low taxes and the relative absence of a culture of education: a love of learning and inquiry. What journalist W. J. Cash termed "the savage ideal"—a demanding fealty to orthodoxy that restricted free thought and speech, prized work but not education, and cast suspicion on intellectuals—has kept a culture of education an unfulfilled regional objective.

The evidence multiplies that states across the South have recognized the connection between educational excellence at all levels and economic progress, and have begun improvements. The question remains how widespread are the awareness of the connection and the consensus to pay for the improvements? Raising educational levels requires a long-term effort. A whole population cannot be brought suddenly to a higher educational plateau. But enabling the South's people to be more versatile and skilled may be the most critical element in improving the quality of life in the South.

ENVIRONMENT

"This land, this South," William Faulkner wrote, "for which God has done so much, with woods for game and streams for fish and deep rich soil for seed and lush springs to sprout it and long summers to manure it and short mild winters for men and animals." Governor William Winter, in his statement to the first meeting of the 1986 Commission on the Future of the South, echoed the sense of those words. He invoked his fellow Mississippian in reference to the Faulknerian myth of a land cursed because Southerners made a deal for power by exploiting human and natural resources to their short-term gain and long-term loss.

Historian Albert Cowdrey took Faulkner's words as the title for the first environmental history of the region, *This Land, This South* (see Appendix A). In that volume and in a shorter paper he prepared for the Commission, Cowdrey cautioned against certain cherished legends.

One is that European and African settlers entered a pristine environment where the native Americans were natural ecologists. To the contrary, they had domesticated corn and transformed

the land by slash-and-burn agriculture, which halted the forest succession and created the great stands of longleaf pines that white and black settlers found. Not for just the nearly 400 years since Jamestown, Cowdrey writes, but: "For at least 12,000 years and probably much longer the South's plant and animal life have been profoundly transformed by the presence of its dominant species, man."

White and black Southerners, however, imposed new burdens when they arrived. The shores along which they settled were part of "the world's most transient coastline." Exploiting what for a long time seemed inexhaustible resources, the newcomers paid scant heed to the fragility of the land they had occupied. With notable exceptions—the Black Belt, the alluvial regions, the bluegrass, among others—the soils tend to be poor and highly erodable. Long before the Revolutionary War, soil depletion had become a factor in the agriculture of the Southern colonies.

The worst times were probably the years of the late 1800's when, with the growth of railroads and the development of refrigerator cars, professional hunters decimated many species, and cut-and-run loggers deforested large areas of the South. Today, the ability to profitably clear and drain land on a massive scale is rapidly diminishing the South's freshwater wetlands, from hardwood bottomlands along the Mississippi River to pocosin wetlands in the eastern Carolinas. But as Cowdrey cautions, a short history of southern environmental change "cannot capture what was always a complex reality."

Much in the way of environmental improvement has been accomplished since the turn of the century. Dozens of threatened species of wild animals have been preserved. Reforestation reversed the destruction of southern woodlands. Since the 1930s soil conservation programs and enlarged pasturage have advanced the greening of the South. King Cotton has been overthrown, one sometimes suspects by King Soybean. But it is not clear whether the improvements have kept pace with our capacity to do harm.

Robert Healy (see Appendix E) argues that the South's environmental future is linked to global economics and the recognition of our natural resources' unpriced values: their economic worth which is not reflected by today's market prices.

Unlike land in many other regions, much of the acreage in the South could serve a variety of uses—for woodland, pasture, row crops, or development. Much of the South's soybean production is exported; international soybean demand will determine how land is used in the South. Soybean demand depends on the growth rate of foreign economies, the value of the dollar relative to other currencies, competition from foreign soybean suppliers such as Brazil, and the ability of less developed nations to sell goods in the U.S. to earn the foreign exchange needed to buy southern soybeans.

Similarly, the use of southern forests depends on whether the federal government decides to accelerate the timber harvest on government land in the West and on competition from timber products from Canada and South America.

In the cattle industry, as with crops and forest products, foreign competition and changing market tastes will play a large role. As Healy notes, in our increasingly interdependent world the cattle industry in the South will be affected by whether Latin American countries permit their tropical forests to be turned into cattle pasture.Healy asks: "Will we eat more hamburger, and less steak? If so, the South gains an advantage, because the region is specialized in grass-fed animals, rather than the grain-fed beef cattle . . . [that] grade choice or prime. Will we eat more chicken. . . . decide that fish is good for our hearts?" If so, the South's leadership in poultry production and aquaculture will benefit the region. The answers to these questions will play a large role in how the South uses its environment.

External economic forces will have a large effect on how the South conserves and develops its environment. But so will economic decisions the South *chooses* to make: how the South accounts for environmental values to which the market has not yet assigned a price. In the past, the South and other regions have tended to undervalue the worth of such assets as clean water and the safe treatment of wastes, only to be faced with expensive remedies later on, remedies paid for by all taxpayers, not just those who created the problem. Robert Healy argues that freshwater wetlands and underground water are the two unpriced values of the natural environment most threatened in the South today.

As Healy notes, "These may be hardwood bottomlands along the Mississippi or the Atchafalaya; pocosin wetlands in North or South Carolina, or river corridors in Georgia or Florida. When the rural South was settled, the early farmers passed these areas over—they were just too hard to drain and clear with manpower and mulepower. So they still stand as undeveloped islands in an overwhelmingly human-influenced landscape. Now, with draglines and Caterpillar tractors, farmers or the forest industry can move into these areas whenever the price of soybeans or lumber is high enough to justify the expense. Over the last 10 years, the southern states have made great progress in protecting their coastal, saltwater wetlands from . . . development. But the freshwater wetlands have very little protection; in many cases they are destroyed and no one even notices."

An estimated six out of every 10 Southerners, some 35 million in all, use groundwater as a drinking supply source. Groundwater withdrawls in areas such as Tidewater Virginia, the coastal Carolinas, the rice-growing region of eastern Arkansas, southwest Georgia, and central and western Florida have caused water tables to drop, in some places by hundreds of feet. The southern states have yet to make much headway in protecting recharge areas for groundwater, or in developing water laws to allocate water and encourage its conservation. As Healy notes, "There is plenty of water in the South, and it gives the South some advantages over competing regions, but there is not enough water to waste."

"Groundwater quality is even more important than groundwater quantity," Healy writes. "And here the relation of agricultural change to environmental quality is very apparent. The South is a very heavy user of pesticides—it has 14 percent of the nation's cropland, but 43 percent of the insecticides applied and 22 percent of the herbicides. Much of the land on which these chemicals are applied is sandy, and water and chemical contaminants move readily into groundwater. . . . Florida is now spending $2 million per year to test groundwater for EDB and other chemicals. Other southern states, where agricultural chemical use is also high, should be doing the same. It's very expensive, . . . but it seems to be worthwhile, both in terms of the dangers to human health and the fact that once contaminated, an aquifer may be impossible to ever clean up."

To deal with the natural environment alone, however, is not yet to exhaust the subject of this land. There is a built environment too, a "vernacular landscape" which many Southerners cherish. Southerners have long been credited with a strong sense of past and place. They have pioneered historic preservation, but the booster ethic in many places has bulldozed a significant portion of the built environment and erected structures with scant relation to history.

This, David Goldfield argues, is simply bad business. As one of Flannery O'Connor's characters put it: "Beauty is our money crop." It is so not only for those communities like Charleston, Savannah, and New Orleans, which have an active tourist trade, but for many communities seeking to attract desirable growth—aside from its intrinsic value to the quality of life in the community.

There is a danger that leaders can too easily dismiss this as the concern merely of an elite. Savannah has shown this to be untrue by arrangements to locate low-income families in restored houses instead of driving them out. Charleston has set an example in the design and setting of public housing, adapting the detached house to multi-family needs and attempting to blend it into the city's tradition.

Paying greater attention to valuable features of our rural landscape, particularly where booming urban and suburban growth is poised to overrun them, is urgently needed. In an example of Hardin's Tragedy of the Commons, each sprawling step outward from the cities seems to promise gains, but the South suffers from its loss of "room to stretch out." Healy suggests that efforts to get ordinary people more interested in their built environment, inventories of valued features of the rural landscape, and a new southern architectural heritage that borrows themes from our past are needed. Leaving belts of green near our cities, so that they do not grow together like those in other regions, is a challenge that the South seems to have barely begun thinking about.

A recurrent question is whether, in Cowdrey's words, "an individualistic people" can work together to "enable large populations to inhabit what was, for so many generations, a half empty land." John Reed has suggested that collaboration of states and localities with non-profit groups may work best where traditions of fierce individualism still hold sway.

A current example of such collaboration is the State Natural Heritage programs (see Appendix F). In each state, under a contractual partnership, The Nature Conservancy sets up an Opera-

tions Center, hires, trains, and supervises a staff of biologists, ecologists, and data managers. After an initial contract period the state absorbs the program, which undertakes to make inventories of critical areas. This information has been widely used in decision-making by state and federal agencies and by developers.

The Nature Conservancy, incidentally, estimates that in the South there are currently more than 2,000 species and natural communities that are critically endangered, only 15 percent of which are adequately protected. To protect the rest will call for conservation of over 6,000 sites.

Encouragement or collaboration might be offered private efforts like Ducks Unlimited, Bassmasters, land conservancies, environmental groups, and local hunting, fishing, and garden clubs, among others.

CULTURE

The Southern Growth Policies Board provided the impetus to founding the Southern Arts Federation in 1975 to "assist in furthering the cultural development of the region." In a paper prepared for the Commission, Sharon Donahue underscored the symbiotic relationship between growth and the arts, each contributing to the advancement of the other (see Appendix G).

Twelve years ago, the first Commission on the Future of the South stated that "the South is unique in its opportunity to preserve and promote native regional arts and crafts, while at the same time developing appreciation and availability of our more universal cultural heritage." It is the "universal cultural heritage" which has been the chief beneficiary of support. The predominant and most visible support has accrued to the region's major cultural institutions—the dance companies, symphonies, museums, theaters, and performing arts centers located in urban areas.

Native and folk arts—mostly rural, some uniquely southern—have received less support, and face the prospect of being lost with the decline of the rural culture that nurtured them. As historian Pete Daniel notes (see Appendix D), "Southern music—gospel, blues, and country—evolved in rural areas. Story telling and later fiction has been a major contribution of rural people. Churches have been at the center of rural communities. The way of life that revolved around these institutions is now threatened, perhaps doomed."

The Southern Arts Federation has begun a major initiative to promote the arts in rural areas, using both public and private funding. The initiative is particularly important during this time of restructuring in the rural South.

CONCLUSION

The South, as Albert Cowdrey states, "is passing beyond its settlement phase; its distinctive institutions, the urban and technological life that helps to distinguish it from the past, have taken form. The interaction of the newest with the oldest South, the South of woods and rivers, marshes and savannahs, summer heat and autumn storm, will help to define the meaning of life to those who live there in time to come."

But we need to remember that it is not some hypothetical "future generations" that will be affected by our actions. The future generation is here, as Robert Healy of the Conservation Foundation has illustrated:

"I have a son who is five years old," Healy writes. "We tend to think of long-range planning as planning for the year 2000. But it is sobering to think that even at the current average life expectancy, my son and others of his generation will spend more than half their lives after the year 2015. We talk about planning for future generations in the South, and in the country as a whole. But we need to take a long view to protect the interests not of some hypothetical future generations, but of the generation that is being born today. . . . The prospect of future change impels us, I think, to take a profoundly conservative attitude toward our rural land, trying to identify what is truly important, what we truly value, so that we can keep what we want, even as we allow an expanding economy and changing technology to carry us on to new, and probably more intense, rural land use."

RECOMMENDATIONS

There is no shortage of suggestions for protecting and improving the quality of Southerners' lives. These few recommendations, arising from the work of the 1986 Commission on the Future of the South, convey an urgency which suggests that the next Commission, meeting in 1992, will not have as ready an opportunity to act on them as we do now.*

- *States should devote far greater attention to a full range of water management actions*. By 1992, states which have not done so should adopt strategic statewide water management plans, which (i) clearly delineate state and local responsibilities for protecting and allocating water resources, (ii) provide the funding to implement the plans, and (iii) include necessary laws, ordinances, and regulations to provide strong protection for water quality. States should target efforts towards protecting water supply reservoirs and groundwater recharge zones, conserving freshwater and saltwater wetlands, and controlling agricultural and urban runoff. Protection requires that states and localities take a more active role in managing both the use of land and the processes that occur on the land near water bodies and above acquifers. Rapid metropolitan development and this year's drought point to the need for greater attention to water management for both quality and quantity. Water may be to the 1990's what energy was to the 1970's: an abundant, undervalued resource taken for granted, but with the potential for great economic disruption if mismanaged.
- *Waste management efforts remain inadequate and should be upgraded*. Quick fixes and temporary solutions present dual dangers. They underrepresent the true cost of managing waste, hindering efforts to reduce waste generation, and they portend more expensive clean-up efforts in the future. By 1992, each southern state should develop fee schedules applied to waste generation which encourage recycling and recoup the full cost of using the safest long-term methods of waste disposal.
- *States should establish credible and professional state level departments of environmental management and improve environmental data gathering and management*, by expanding efforts such as the State Natural Heritage Programs. By 1992, each southern state should have an integrated, computerized, geographically based environmental information system to track a wide range of water quality, air quality, wildlife, waste, and land use indicators. The public sector has a strong comparative advantage over the private sector in collecting and disseminating information. This role should be greatly expanded to provide high quality environmental information to a broad array of public and private sector clients.
- *States should grant localities broad powers to manage growth and to raise revenues to meet costs generated by rapid growth, subject to strong state minimum standards*. States should work with localities to develop rational, sophisticated development impact review processes, and impact fee schedules. By 1992, each southern state should have a systematic process for state level review of very large scale developments and developments in areas of critical statewide environmental importance. By 1992, each state should grant localities the ability to raise revenues from development impact fees or similar means, and should provide technical assistance, particularly to small towns and rural areas.
- *States should become more active in preserving important historic, cultural, and artistic resources*. By 1992, states should develop low-interest loan revolving funds, provide tax incentives, and use other creative mechanisms to keep restoration and rehabilitation of historic buildings an economical alternative to demolition and new construction. Preservation measures traditionally oriented towards cities or environmentally sensitive areas should be applied to selected rural areas. States should target more arts funding to retain, disseminate, and celebrate traditional folk arts and culture, working closely with the private sector and nonprofit organizations.

* Educational recommendations can be found in the *Report of the Committee on Human Resource Development* and are not repeated here.

APPENDIX A

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN THE SOUTH:
EDUCATION, EQUITY, AND THE QUALITY OF LIFE

A position paper prepared for the
Commission on the Future of the South
Southern Growth Policies Board

Dr. David R. Goldfield
Department of History
University of North Carolina
at Charlotte

Some decades before the Civil War, Thomas Sutpen came down from the hills of western Virginia to establish a landed empire on the Mississippi frontier. Working alongside his slaves, Sutpen hewed a prosperous plantation out of swamps and hardwood forests. Eventually, both Sutpen and his domain disintegrated, victims of avarice and a race pride that denied kin and love. As Sutpen's fate unfolds in William Faulkner's *Absalom Absalom!* (1936), it becomes a biblical parable: God presented the Southerner with a kingdom rich and beautiful; but the Southerner yielded to temptation, to the lure of profits generated from the callous exploitation of the land and the false pride of white supremacy.

When Faulkner published the book in 1936, race pride and evironmental exploitation still cursed the South. And like Sutpen, the South's Faustian deal for power in exchange for the denigration of its human and natural resources led to disaster. A majority of the region's residents lived and worked under the burdens of a ruinous agricultural system and a biracial society that impoverished the mind and soul of the Southerner, white and black. In 1938, a Presidential commission reporting on economic conditions in the South labeled the region as the nation's "Number One economic problem."

In the decades after 1940, Southerners began to expiate their sins, albeit with considerable federal intercession. The land and labor systems that undergirded monocrop agriculture crumbled. The South segued gracefully from a commercial-agricultural economy to a post-industrial society without so much as a by-your-leave to the industrial revolution. The omission meant that the physical and human debris littering the cities of the Northeast and Midwest would not obstruct new forms of economic development in the metropolitan South. And the service-oriented economy was kinder on the environment than was the industrial economy. Indeed, the cities themselves were not so much cities as elongated suburbs: low-density and squeaky-clean. As with the economy, the new southern city seemed to have jumped a century, moving from village to suburb confounding urban scholars more used to Chicago, Boston, or New York than to the medium-sized oozing entities that sprawled across the southern landscape.

Finally, Southerners attained a racial accommodation. If whites have not been totally successful in expiating the sin of race pride at least white supremacy is no longer the controlling factor of southern life. The net in-migration of blacks beginning in the late 1960's is testimony itself both to the altered racial climate and the new economic opportunities. The accommodation unleashed a new energy and optimism into the region as well as renewed attention from outside investors eager to do business in a place where relative racial harmony existed alongside traditional southern attributes of lifestyle, climate, labor, and taxes.

One of the more remarkable aspects of these economic and racial transformations has been the retention of southern traditions that enhance and make distinct the regional quality of life. As sociologist John Shelton Reed, among others, has demonstrated, Southerners in the 1980's still evince a strong sense of past and place, deeply-held religious beliefs, and remain concerned about good manners. Coupled with food, music, speech, and climate differentials, the South persists as a distinctive region, despite its integration into the national (and international) economy. In fact, these aspects of southern lifestyle have enhanced the region's economic position as national lifestyle preferences have changed since the 1960's. Pace of life, leisure, esthetics, space, and roots have become more important to Americans, especially as these attributes have diminished in many parts of the country.

But these traditions are not impermeable. The South has undergone three stages of economic development since 1940. The first period, extending from 1940 to 1965, was the era of Transition as the South shed its historic dependence on agriculture for more urban-oriented activities ranging from high-tech to finance, administration, and education. The second era, lasting from 1965 to 1980, was a time of Consolidation when the metropolitan economy completed the transition to a post-industrial base and began to generate related subsidiary activities, especially those derived from local entrepreneurial energy and the branching of major corporations located elsewhere. It was also an era when blacks began to participate meaningfully in regional life reducing the wastefulness of a segregated society and broadening the potential talent base within the region. This period coincided with the rise of the Sun Belt, an artificial media-inspired region (including much of the South) that had allegedly sucked the nation's economic, demographic, and political lifeblood and faced a promising future.

Since 1980, we have entered an era of Competition. The Northeast and parts of the Midwest have extricated themselves from the economic doldrums, re-tooled, and have come out fighting for economic development. The limitless economic horizon seems more restricted for the South today. In 1985, the states with the largest employment gains were California, New York, and Ohio. By the year 2000, the Ford Foundation predicted more than one half of all new jobs will be concentrated in thirty metropolitan areas, most outside the South, with Los Angeles and Boston leading the way.

Three interrelated issues hold the potential for either enhancing or limiting the South's effectiveness in this new national competition: education, equity, and quality of life. We are entering an era of new partnership concerning economic development. The withdrawal of the federal government from numerous pump-priming programs requires creative relationships at the state and local levels. The most productive of these is the university-business-government consortium, an arrangement that helped to produce the Research Triangle Park in North Carolina and the NASA complex in Houston. It is a partnership that has proved crucial in the resurrection of the ailing Northeast and in Midwestern centers such as Chicago and Minneapolis. There are several top-flight universities in the South, but not enough. Resources are spread too thin over biracial systems and some legislatures engage in pork barrel education, resulting in the proliferation of community colleges, technical schools, and redundant programs.

The problem extends far below the university level, of course, to public school systems that produce students ill-suited to participate either as citizens or workers in the technological and informational activities that characterize the nation's new economic life. When no southern state meets the national average for teacher's salary, and when one out of three adult Southerners lacks a high school degree, the South becomes less attractive to post-industrial economic investors. As Tennessee Governor Lamar Alexander has noted, "If 90 percent of the people have a high school education in Minneapolis and 67 percent do in Tennessee, we're not going to be able to keep up, much less catch up."

Several southern states have passed comprehensive educational packages, some including tax increases to fund necessary improvements. The battle will be a long and difficult one because of the South's lengthy tradition of low taxes and the relative absence of a culture of education. In an overwhelmingly rural region, work not education was the prized commodity, and for at least two segments of the population, blacks and women, formal education was futile, if not dangerous. Moreover, there is a strong anti-intellectual tradition in the region, what journalist W. J. Cash termed "the savage ideal," a demanding fealty to racial and political orthodoxy that restricted free thought and speech and cast suspicion on intellectuals in general. Though variety has replaced orthodoxy for the most part, the periodic outbursts of pressures to conform to particular values and the overemphasis on athletics indicate that an educational culture—a love of learning and inquiry—remains an unfulfilled regional objective. Hopefully, state-directed educational campaigns on this issue as well as the growing influence of newcomers from other parts of the country will moderate those attitudes.

The second issue crucial to economic development is equity—geographic equity and social equity. Wide disparities exist between southern states—Louisiana and Florida, for example– and within states, urban and rural areas. Unemployment in the rural South is 37 percent higher than in the urban South. The post-industrial economy will merely exacerbate this gap since the metropolitan South possesses the requisite transportation and communications networks, educational facilities, cultural activities, and health facilities to attract and maintain a modern economic base. The rural South, once the repository of cheap labor and land, low taxes, and a pliant elite that proved attractive to labor-intensive industries is searching for a future. And the small town, the characteristic southern urban place, is bleeding. Rural enterprise zones, incentives to generate local investments, and road building programs are potential policies designed to ameliorate rural distress. But, if rural-urban disparities widen, the social and financial burdens on the states and the cities could impinge upon economic development.

The post-industrial economy has also produced a bifurcated metropolitan labor market where low-skilled or unskilled workers are separated from potential jobs on the metropolitan periphery. The types of service jobs available for this group offer a minimum wage with little hope for advancement. The shape of the southern metropolis further inhibits an assault on this problem since

the vast distances sharply separate metropolitan populations from one another. Poverty does not exist or is not a problem because it is unseen by the white collar army that advances and retreats from home and workplace in hermetic safety, with many no longer needing to venture into the city at all, either for work or for shopping.

The third issue related to the South's future economic development is the fate of the quality of life attributes, especially attachment to past and place. Southerners have evinced a strong sense of history. In earlier eras, this backward gaze became fixed and so clouded over with myth that history became another obstacle to dealing with the harsh realities that characterized regional life for nearly a century after the Civil War. In another sense, however, history has served as a valuable connector to ancestors and events that provide a sense of continuity and rootedness in the ephemeral and mobile post-industrial society. Southerners are not above conversing with long-dead forebears or anthropomorphizing building, trees, or pick-up trucks. The rapid growth after World War II, however, has jeopardized and even destroyed some of the South's built heritage, especially in the cities.

Even though the region has been a pioneer in the historic preservation movement, the booster ethic—an exaggerated fixation with growth born of the South's long economic inferiority to the rest of the country—has bulldozed a significant portion of the region's built environment and worse, erected structures that bear scant architectural relationship to the region's past. The homogenization of downtown, residential, and shopping mall design cuts the Southerner off from his past and offers no clues for newcomers about what this place is about, its heritage and meaning. The inattention to history is also bad business; history is something that the South can offer in the new competitive era of economic development. Specifically, cities and towns have taken and can take the following steps to renew their past:

1. that establishment of design review panels to ensure that new structures relate in some way to that community's history or to regional themes in general;
2. that communities utilize techniques such as infill and adapative re-use in order to preserve the physical scale of residential and commercial districts;
3. draft local legislation to protect historic structures and use preservation techniques such as historic district zoning to ensure the character of a particular area as well as the protection of individual structures;
4. that downtown, either through a market place, cultural center, or commercial row provide a direct link to the community's origins; downtown would also be the location for a history museum depicting the community's past through material culture, photographs, and documents.

Intimately connected with the sense of past as a quality of life issue is the sense of place. From music to literature, from avocation to vocation, Southerners have demonstrated their attachment to the land. As the Sutpen saga implies, intimacy has often bred profligacy. Yet, even as the South has urbanized, Southerners have sought to moderate that urban environment through plantings, landscaping, and a low-density spatial profile, continuing a tradition dating at least as far back as James Oglethorpe's plan for Savannah in 1733. "Beauty is our money crop," a character in a Flannery O'Connor short story boasted of his town, and the numerous azalea and dogwood festivals, the spring home tours, and the beautification boards support the connection between economy and esthetics. The danger is that administrators and planners may consider beauty expendable, an elitist concern of those who have the time and money to contemplate such things. This is untrue as Charleston, South Carolina has discovered in its design and setting of public housing recently, adapting the graceful single detached house to multi-family needs, at the same time reinforcing the sense of past. Further, newcomers often remark on the relative beauty of southern cities and towns, enhanced by the long growing season and the attempt to modify the harsh summer climate with trees and bushes placed at strategic and frequent intervals. The southern city is a middle landscape combining rural elements with urban features and urban policy should reinforce this concept.

The South has been fortunate to experience its most significant growth in an era of raised environmental consciousness. Though paper mills in the Savannah area, chemical factories in the Richmond region, land development in marshlands and along the coast, and the petro-chemical industries in Louisiana and Texas have threatened areas of the natural South, state environmental legislation in the 1970's and early 1980's have reduced the opportunities for future defacement. In

addition, public awareness is such that political support for polluting industry has declined. The difficulty, however, is that such industries are usually attracted to rural areas or small communities and the temptation will be great as the urban-rural gap widens to accept the environmental costs in favor of immediate economic benefits. In addition, as the national competition for economic base accelerates, there could be less pressure on new economic activities located in metropolitan areas to plan their complexes with environmental sensitivity or to maintain the historic character of buildings or parklands in the path of development.

Whatever the benefits of such temptations in the short-run, they are, like Thomas Sutpen's exploitation, false economies in the long run. As we are confronted with the setting of the Sun Belt and the rise of the Brain Belt, the quality of amenities, especially education, culture, and environment become central factors in locational decisions both by individuals and by firms. The fact that Massachusetts and Ohio have emerged among the national leaders in economic development is indicative of the fact that tax incentives, low tax base, nonunion labor, and cheap land costs are no longer the surefire attractions they once were. Rather, the advantages possessed by areas within both states include education, culture, history, and attention to reversing the environmental depredations of an earlier era.

Though southern states continue to lag in educational and cultural amenities, most have programs in place to upgrade these areas. The region's great advantages in the competitive Brain Belt era are its rich history and its relatively unspoiled environment. These attributes should be nurtured and promoted as among the South's major economic attractions. And the types of individuals and firms attracted by the anchors of past and place are likely to contribute significantly to reducing the threats of educational inadequacy and inequitable distribution of resources.

The three major issues influencing future economic development in the region are, then, closely connected. Without a significant educational base, it is likely that the South will lose its favored position in the national economy over the next several decades. This, in turn, will make it more difficult to redress locational and social inequities, increasing burdens on local and state governments. And, finally, as has been the case historically, these burdens will threaten the distinctive southern quality of life, particularly impinging on past and place. The turning away from regional heritage will complete the vicious cycle by further reducing the competitiveness of the South within the national economy. What is required, therefore, is an integrated approach to economic development that takes particular cognizance of the changing economic role of the South and the attributes necessary to maintain and enhance the region's status.

APPENDIX B

SOUTHERN PUBLIC OPINION ON THE SOUTH'S QUALITY OF LIFE

A position paper prepared for the
Commission on the Future of the South
Southern Growth Policies Board

Dr. John Shelton Reed
Department of Sociology
University of North Carolina
at Chapel Hill

INTRODUCTION

Southerners like the South, warts and all. And many deny that there are any warts.

Item. The theme of nostalgia and affection for the South, conspicuous in American popular music during the first half of the twentieth century, survives—indeed, flourishes—in dozens of country music songs today: more so even than a generation ago.

Item. When the Gallup Poll asks Americans where they would live if they could live anywhere they wanted, Southerners are more likely than other Americans (save only Californians) to say "right here," and they have been more likely to say this for at least a half-century.

Item. Residents of southern states are more likely than other Americans (again, except for Californians) to tell pollsters that the "best American state" is their own.

Item. Historically, Southerners have been at least as likely as other Americans to leave their home region, but the South's economic development of the past few decades appears to be changing that: fewer now leave, and many who left earlier are returning.

Item. Asked to name the worst thing about the South, a substantial minority of Southerners—one in five, in a North Carolina survey in the early 1970's—reply that there is nothing "worst" about the South.

Southerners who do dislike something about the South dislike precisely those things the Commission on the Future of the South has been directed to do something about. Who could like the South's per capita income, its industry mix, its poverty or unemployment rate, or its standing with regard to most of the things that governments routinely collect statistics about?

Those things aside, however, most Southerners seem to like what they have. As one North Carolinian told an interviewer: "I can't think of anything bad about [the South], other than we don't make too much money down here." Money is important, but it is not the only fact with consequences for a region's quality of life. Few Southerners use that phrase—they are more likely to talk about "the southern way of life" or, regrettably, the southern "lifestyle"—but most apparently feel that the South's non-economic amenities offset any economic disadvantages when it comes to deciding what to call the "best American state," where to write songs about, where to live.

What do Southerners like about the South? What is this "way of life" that they are so fond of? Wherever we turn for an answer to that question—to the lyrics of country music, to the letters columns of southern newspapers, to the archives of public opinion poll data—we get a remarkably consistent set of answers. If I concentrate on the last of these sources, it is only because they are not so generally accessible as the others. Before I summarize those data, however, a couple of warnings are in order.

First, asking what people like about something—about the South, in this case—is an inherently conservative approach. Southerners cannot like aspects of southern life that do not exist; we do not hear, for example, that the best thing about the South is its many ethnic restaurants, or opera companies. This does not mean that Southerners would not like these things, if they existed, but we are asking—and so we are told—about what they like now. Those things may be worth preserving, but they are not the only good things imaginable.

In addition, we should bear in mind that when Southerners tell us about the South, they almost invariably do it with reference to the non-southern United States. "What do you like about the South?" is almost always understood to imply "compared to the North." In consequence, Southerners simply do not mention important characteristics of southern life, components of any sensible "quality of life" measure, if they are not seen as ways in which the South is different from the non-South. It goes without saying, apparently, that Southerners like about the South what they like

Extensive quotations in this paper are from J. S. Reed, *Southerners: The Social Psychology of Sectionalism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983). Other material is adapted from J. S. Reed, *One South: An Ethnic Approach to Regional Culture* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), chapters 10 and 12, "Plastic-Wrapped Crackers: Southern Culture and Social Change" and "Summertime and the Livin' is Easy: Quality of Life in the South."

about America in general. It certainly does not follow that these American "good things"—political freedom, the rule of law—are unimportant.

With those general limitations in mind, I can report that most Southerners apparently do believe that the South is different from the rest of the United States in important respects. Most prefer it that way. Individual Southerners like many different things about the South, some of them contradictory, but most agree about a couple of ways in which it is superior. When asked what they like about the South, majorities of Southerners mention pleasant natural conditions and pleasant people.

NATURAL CONDITIONS

The thing, you know, that I miss most of all
Is the freedom of the rivers and the pines.
—Hank Williams, Jr.

Many Southerners agree with Bocephus, as indicated by this excerpt, from a summary of the North Carolina survey mentioned earlier:

> Although some [respondents] complained about heat, humidity, insects, and the like when asked for "the worst thing about the South," most . . . seemed to like the physical environment of their region. When we asked what the best thing is, two-thirds mentioned the South's climate, its forests, mountains, or coast, its lack of crowding and pollution, the opportunities it offers for outdoor recreation. In general, they seemed to agree with William Faulkner's view that the South is fortunate that God has done so much for it, and man so little.

The report goes on to quote some of the survey respondents:

> [I like] the open spaces, the uncrowded roads and countryside. The physical environment agrees with me.
>
> The climate, the mild winter and change of seasons; the fact that air pollution and overcrowding isn't as prevalent as in the Northeast.
>
> It's green, clean-looking, not eat-up with pollution.
>
> I like the climate and open spaces and fresh food.
>
> It's beautiful here. A good place to bring children up. Living conditions are better in general. Recreation is better. I like to fish.
>
> I like the mountains, beaches. . . . This is just a good place to live. Not as crowded or polluted as the North.
>
> Used to be able to say clean air, but you can't say that any more. There's plenty of room to stretch out.

The report noted that this last theme—"room to stretch out"—was a common one:

> [Many] volunteered that the South is "not as crowded" as the North, that it still offers "roominess" and "wide open spaces," that people are "not piled up so bad." Several mentioned "freedom" in the same breath as lack of crowding.

A good many respondents volunteered that the absence of big cities and big-city problems was an asset; almost no one saw the relative absence of cities as a problem *per se*.

Of course, these aspects of the South—seen and valued, ironically, as contributing to the region's quality of life—are by-products of economic underdevelopment, and they are now increasingly menaced by urban and suburban sprawl, by industrialization, by population increase. A further irony is that the public policies that could preserve some of these amenities often conflict with other southern values, in particular with a widespread, absolutist view of property rights.

Whether one views the prickly southern individualism that W. J. Cash wrote about in *The Mind of the South* as an obstacle or a resource, it is still with us. Roy Reed described it (exaggerating a bit, no doubt) for the readers of the *New York Times*, in 1976. The example he used to illustrate it is very much to the present point:

> It is no accident that the most determined holdouts against land-use legislation in the United States are country people from the South. They will take care of their own land, and let the next man take care of his. If the next man puts in a rendering plant or a junkyard, that is his business.

> "For all the American encroachments," he continued (and I cannot resist quoting him), the South is inhabited and given [its] dominant tone by men—and women who acquiesce in this matter—who carry in their hearts or genes or livers or lights an ancient, God-credited belief that a man has a right to do as he pleases. A right to be let alone in whatever plain of triumph he has staked out and won for his own. A right to go to hell or climb to the stars or sit still and do nothing, just as he damn well pleases, without restraint from anybody else and most assuredly without interference from any government anywhere.

Reed believes that this orientation is doomed, that the fight was lost "about the time [a man] lost the irretrievable right to take a leak off his own front porch." But, he observes, "they have not yet taken [Southerners'] right to curse and defy"—as many would-be land-use planners can no doubt attest.

No, any governmental attempt to preserve for Southerners what they say they like about the southern landscape will come in for a good deal of suspicion, especially if government tries to *forbid* certain activities. People—perhaps especially Southerners—do not like being told what they cannot do, especially with their own property.

On the other hand, I suspect much could be done by government's *encouraging* various other activities—those of private organizations like the Nature Conservancy, for example. If the subject is approached imaginatively and with sensitivity to what it is that Southerners actually value, Southern business and industry may even have an important role to play. In a study of the business elite of North Carolina, Paul Luebke found surprising support for at least some forms of wilderness and wildlife preservation. That it came from businessmen who like to hunt and fish suggests a powerful constituency willing to support conservation, so long as it is not called "environmentalism." This enthusiasm is not limited to wealthy duck hunters and dry-fly fishermen either, and for the time being at least it persists among urban Southerners: one survey showed southern city folk more likely to hunt than rural people elsewhere in the United States.

Organizations like Ducks Unlimited, Bassmasters, and local hunting, fishing, and garden clubs may have a great deal to contribute. Certainly state and local governments would be foolish to ignore the commitment of these groups and the political and economic resources at their disposal.

GOOD PEOPLE

> We say grace and we say ma'am;
> If you ain't into that, we don't give a damn.
> —Hank Williams, Jr.

Southerners see the South as different from the rest of the country not only in its natural resources, but in human terms as well. In general, Southerners see themselves as slower, more conservative, and more polite and friendly than other Americans. Some studies have shown that other Americans are generally prepared to grant them those differences, although not all Americans are ready to allow that these comparisons are to the South's advantage. Not even all Southerners are.

But most Southerners, apparently, like what they see as "southern" characteristics. When asked what they like best about the South half of the respondents to the survey mentioned earlier said the people were. When asked to describe Southerners, most were unstinting in their praise:

> Far and away the most frequent characterization of Southerners (by these Southerners) was an elaboration on the theme that Southerners are good people, as several said in so many words. "Good," to our respondents, meant primarily pleasant to be around: "considerate," "friendly," "cordial," "genteel," "courteous," "congenial," "nice"—all of these our respondents' words, many of them used often.

Again, the report provides examples of typical respondents' remarks:

> People in the South for the most part are more cordial and courteous than those I've found in the North. People have more consideration of one another.
>
> It's a sort of graciousness—gentility and a hospitality feeling— in people native to the South.

> Well, I find people friendly here everywhere I go.
> I have a great feeling of being respected and welcomed here.
> [The best thing about the South] is the attitude and friendly people as a whole. We live more like God intended us to live in relation to one another.

The report notes that "dissenting opinions were rare and were almost entirely voiced by migrants from the North," but even many migrants felt the same. As the wife of a chemical plant manager, a ten-year resident of North Caroline, put it: "I like the slow pace. Also the friendliness."

Many Southerners believe that the texture of daily life is more pleasant in the South, perhaps especially in casual, impersonal interactions like those in the course of shopping or business. There is obviously a danger of regional chauvinism here, but consider the possibility that our survey respondents might be correct. I think they are, as a matter of fact. This sort of thing is difficult to measure; it does not appear in government statistics. But one recent University of Michigan survey shows higher percentages of Southerners than of non-Southerners reporting that their lives are "very friendly." Call this "pseudo-Gemeinschaft" if you are cynical, but any civility that persists in the marketplace is worth noting, celebrating, and—if possible—preserving.

How much can be preserved remains, to me at least, an open question. Although an easygoing and cordial mode of interaction is not a universal characteristic of rural and village cultures, it seems obvious to me that in the South it has been linked to small-town and rural life. Certainly it is inconsistent with the stereotypical urban life—anonymous, transient, and characterized by hurried interaction with a great many others. Civility "costs" more and "pays" less in the metropolis. If southern cities have so far remained "southern," in this sense, it may be only because so many of their inhabitants grew up and learned their manners, styles, and values in small towns and the southern countryside. The crucial question is what the next generation of urban Southerners (the first generation to be a majority of the southern population) will look like.

In addition, southern metropolitan areas have been, along with specialized retirement communities, the principal destination for migrants from outside the South. Although it is easy to overstate the cultural impact of migration on the South as a whole, there is no question that many of our metropolitan areas have been profoundly shaped by these newcomers. And when it comes to "manners, styles, and values," there is often some question of who will assimilate whom.

Of course, as Herbert Gans reminds us in *Urban Villagers*, metropolitan areas are not culturally uniform—perhaps no one will be "assimilated." And Gans also reminds us that urban neighborhoods are not even all culturally "urban." If cultural characteristics of the small-town and rural South are preserved in southern cities, it will be because a critical mass of southern city-dwellers have contrived to become "urban villagers," in stable, settled neighborhoods, with small, established institutions—churches, schools, and the like; in effect, recreating the small-town South in an urban setting.

THE FUTURE

> If heaven ain't a lot like Dixie, I don't want to go.
> If heaven ain't a lot like Dixie, I'd just as soon stay home.
> —Hank Williams, Jr.

The things that Southerners most often say that they like about the South, we have seen, are threatened by urbanization, by industrialization, by in-migration—by factors, in other words, that seem inextricably connected to the economic modernization that is solving many of the South's problems. The question is not whether these good things can be preserved at their present level—*they will not be*—but rather how much is amenable to preservation at an acceptable cost.

All of the southern states and many southern communities have plainly opted for a major governmental role in their economic development efforts. Is there any part for government in ameliorating the less pleasant consequences of that development? I have already indicated some of the problems in preserving the natural beauty and open spaces of the South; when it comes to preserving amiability and good manners—well, I would not know where to start. The difficulties of attracting new industry are trivial, by comparison.

It is not my purpose—in any case, I am not competent—to suggest what southern policymakers ought to do about these issues. Let me give just two examples, though, of the sorts of policy

that affect these aspects of the southern way of life, and that should not be considered without regard to those effects. (These examples may demonstrate the incompetence I just mentioned).

Tax law has obvious implications for land use, and it can be used to encourage some uses, while discouraging (though not forbidding) others. Several states have already acted to give tax relief to farmers near to cities, whose land has often risen drastically in value due to speculative pressure. This policy is often defended on the grounds of justice for farmers, but note that it also serves the interests of dove-hunters, as well as the aesthetic needs of those who simply like open space nearby.

Similarly, the neighborhood school may be pedagogically inefficient, and it may sometimes be an unlawful impediment to desegregation, but generations of immigrants have demonstrated that it is also a powerful institution for preserving cultural traditions and values in an urban environment that is hostile to them. If urban Southerners are to maintain the rural and small-town ways that many Southerners say they like, neighborhood schools can contribute to that preservation. Certainly they should not be bulldozed without thought to their social and cultural functions, as well as their academic ones.

I suspect that governments' most constructive role will often be simply to stay out of the way, to avoid placing obstacles in the path of private natural and cultural conservation efforts—at best, perhaps, to remove a few obstacles. I have mentioned some of the non-governmental resources that may help the South to avoid northern mistakes in southern settings (no less a danger for being a cliche). Let me close by mentioning a couple more.

In the first place, there is still in the South a level of devotion and commitment to local communities unparalleled elsewhere. In the past, this has often been expressed as mindless boosterism: in my Tennessee hometown, we used to brag about how high on the list of nuclear targets—that is, how important—we were. But the local pride behind that sort of foolishness is sound. Perhaps it will eventually turn against the despoilers of the southern countryside.

Our regional obsession with growth was perfectly understandable, even laudable, in a region as poor as our's once was—and it is still appropriate in those parts of the South that have been bypassed by economic development. But in much of the South, I think, the enthusiasm is beginning to pale. A Chapel Hill savings-and-loan recently advertised that "Well, some of the rest of us are proud of this community, too, but our civic pride tells us that if Chapel Hill grows much more it will no longer be something to be proud of."

Another resource the South has is an abundance of voluntary associations of private citizens, nearly all of them available at least occasionally for public service—innumerable garden clubs, civic clubs, historical and preservation societies, as well as the hunting and fishing clubs I mentioned earlier. Most of all, though, there are the churches of the South, institutions of great, and increasing, wealth and power. Most are, by tradition, as suspicious of government as government (thanks to the Supreme Court's reading of the Constitution) must be of them. They have always worked, however, for what they have seen as community well-being. (That is, after all, what the anti-liquor campaign has been all about.) No policymaker can afford to ignore the churches' past and potential contributions to all aspects of the South's quality of life.

In general, the lesson here for policymakers does not come down to a list of proposals, to an "action agenda" to preserve the endangered non-economic aspects of the southern way of life. Rather, it is an appeal to them to be sensitive to these matters when dealing with other things—property tax law, with school-siting and school-closings, with governmental relations to voluntary organizations of various kinds, with economic development policy.

Everyone, surely, would like to "increase per capita income, reduce poverty, and reduce unemployment," in the fullness of time, if not by 1992. All of these goals of the 1986 Commission on the Future of the South are worthy. There is nothing wrong with pottage; in fact, it is just the thing for a hungry person, or region. But most Southerners recognize—and policymakers should, too—that we do not live by bread alone. Pottage comes at a cost, but maybe that cost is negotiable.

APPENDIX C

THE SOUTHERN ENVIRONMENT AND THE QUALITY OF LIFE

A position paper prepared for the
Commission on the Future of the South
Southern Growth Policies Board

Dr. Albert E. Cowdrey
Washington, DC

In any discussion of ways to improve the South's quality of life, the region's environment deserves careful consideration. To be sure, a number of myths about the region's (and the continent's) past are best discarded. The preColumbian South has been portrayed as a region truly pristine, the Native American as a natural ecologist, the European settlers as invaders who brought sin into the Garden. The reality is both more prosaic and more interesting. The Native Americans were major transformers of the land, by their hunting and especially by their use of fire. The precolumbian forest already bore the marks of human dominance, notably in the stands of longleaf pine, almost certainly created over the course of millenia by the fires associated with native hunting and slash-and-burn agriculture, which destroyed competing species and halted the forest succession. The greatest known loss of wild species in the region's long history—until the 20th century—came some 10,000 years ago at the end of the Pleistocene epoch, the result almost certain of overhunting. For at least 12,000 years and probably much longer, the South's plant and animal life have been profoundly transformed by the presence of its dominant species, man.

Yet the coming of white and black southerners did impose new and heavy burdens upon the environment. With certain evident exceptions—the Black Belt, many alluvial regions, the Great Valley, and the bluegrass country, among others—southern soils tend to be poor and, in sloping country, highly erodable. From very early in the course of settlement, the agriculture practiced by European settlers was subject to market demands which took small account of the environment or its degradation. For centuries southern farming was labor intensive, and as a result a rural population of very poor people grew up, who produced much while consuming little. Among these people the warm climate encouraged the spread of a variety of European and African diseases, while the increasingly unbalanced rural diet produced many deficiency ailments as well. Erosion reached a climax in the two generations that followed the Civil War; extensive deforestation occurred during the same period. The end result was the South of the late 1920's and the Great Depression—the nation's sickly, eroded, cut-over, impoverished economic problem number one.

These conditions need to be remembered, even though the sketch given here is far too brief and oversimplified to capture what was always a complex reality. The southern environment establishes a baseline for development. Southern soils can be managed and fertilized, conserved and husbanded, but they cannot be changed. The southern climate can be either a blessing or a curse, and through much of the region's history has been both. The disease environment has often been devastating in its effects on humans, animals, and plants, on industries like cattle-raising, and on the commerce of cities afflicted by epidemics. Humility in the face of intrinsic limiting factors is a good place to begin any consideration of ways to improve the quality of life, and brings with it the promise of genuine and durable progress if nature is heeded and studied to find the most advantageous points for human intervention.

Remarkable things have already been accomplished, despite the conventional environmentalist rhetoric of decline, destruction, and loss. Since the early years of this century, dozens of threatened species of wild animals have been saved from probable extinction, including the beaver, the white-tailed deer, the egret, the heron, the wild turkey, the wood duck, and the American alligator. Reforestation and tree-farming steadily expanded the area of forest land from the 1930's to about 1965—when rising agricultural land values reversed the process—and the volume of saw timber and growing stock have increased without interruption. Soil conservation practices have spread with the general growth of scientific farming. King Cotton has been dethroned. Hookworm disease and pellagra have been reduced to the status of medical curiosities, and malaria, once as much a regional symbol as the Stars and Bars, virtually extirpated. Southerners can approach with confidence and some justifiable pride in their past achievements the difficult items that remain, or are soon likely to appear, on their environmental agenda.

Surely controls on industrial, urban, and pesticide pollution form one item of unfinished business. Each reflects some aspect of the emerging South: pesticides, the new agriculture; industrial wastes, the new industries, especially oil processing; urban wastes, the growing cities. Post-Depression farming has exchanged folk culture for pop culture, and the sharecropper, boll weevil, and hookworm for the federal subsidy and the broad spectrum insecticide. Because "the farmer who poisoned, profited," toxins have been used with little restraint and under official encouragement, though each new miracle insecticide in turn has produced resistant pests and compelled further experimentation and the introduction of new, and usually expensive, substitutes. Efforts to

substitute practical, environmentally sound controls over insect pests (by introducing predators, planting resistant species, releasing sterile males, employing pheromone traps, etc.) have made only limited headway. Yet reduced pesticide use might be a significant item in reducing the farmer's burden of debt as well as the burden of poisons borne by the environment.

Industrial wastes represent another serious problem. The South receives dangerous substances in many ways—by legal storage, by illicit dumping, and by the natural action of rivers carrying off effluents from the North and the Midwest. In particular, the Mississippi, with all its agricultural and industrial pollutants, poses a danger to communities that drink its water and to the fisheries of the Gulf of Mexico, a sheltered embayment where toxins are especially likely to build up over time. Surely it should not be unreasonable to expect southern lawmakers to take a more positive role in debates over the Superfund and other environmental initiatives that deeply concern their own region.

The region's wetlands are another point of concern. No aspect of the southern environment is under greater stress from drainage, development, urbanization, and erosion. The situation of the Everglades periodically makes the news. The growth of Miami, the presence of extensive corporation farms south of Lake Okeechobee, and the needs of the Everglades have combined to produce a bizarre struggle for water in one of the nation's wettest regions. In Louisiana, the Atchafalaya Basin contains this country's largest freshwater swamp, but also the main channel of the lower Mississippi's floodway system. Unfortunately for the many species that inhabit them, wetlands have a deceptively useless look and long, unhappy history as breeders of malaria. Yet they are also wildlife preserves, marine nurseries, and places of recreational and scientific interest; marshlands along rivers form natural reservoirs in time of flood, and those along the coast serve as buffers against the South's frequent hurricanes.

To contrast the decline of the marshes with the growth of managed forestland is natural and to some extent valid. Yet natural woodlands, outside the state and national parks and forests, are also under pressure. Their industrial value is less than that of managed woodlands, and yet their ecological value is greater; far less orderly than the tree-farm, the natural forest provides more varied habitat that enables a multitude of wild species to survive. Preservation of wetland and forest can probably be best accomplished by exploiting its recreational potential, despite the evident dangers that too many visitors can bring. The Everglades have won protection as a national park and fame as a natural wonder, and the model is instructive. Some environmental damage may result from too many backpackers and birdwatchers, but even more from public incomprehension and indifference.

The study of cities in ecological terms is even less developed than other aspects of environmental history. Cities absorb many complex forms of energy and transform them into waste heat; they produce industrial effluents, sewage, and garbage; they lower the local water table. They also concentrate human intelligence and talent and, surprisingly, environmental interest and concern as well. Over the past century the image of the ideal city has changed from a workshop to a park and then to something resembling a fairground. No doubt all elements are needed for a successful urban scene. Integrating a city into its hinterland requires elaborate controls on development and the treatment of effluents. Methods of waste processing more sophisticated than simply dumping into the nearest stream are now available, but are costly and rife with technical problems. Regional planning through organizations with secure sources of funding and practical power to influence the course of an urban area's growth remains a key to orderly development, and mass transit systems an important means of reducing pollution as well as moving people in and through automobile-choked streets.

Energy production in every form remains central to the quality of life. Invariably, increased energy consumption parallels increased prosperity. Yet the resulting effluents range across a broad spectrum from smoke to heated water to acid rain to nuclear waste. In many ways, hydropower is the least polluting form of energy that is cost-effective and widely available, but the South is poor in waterfalls and rich in placid, silt-heavy alluvial streams that are poor producers of power, either hydraulic or electrical. Some Corps of Engineers and TVA impoundments produce clean electric power while improving navigability. The multitude of artificial lakes that result from the flooding of lowlands behind the dams have created new recreational resources while making some parts of the South resemble glacial areas. Unfortunately, the flooding of lowlands behind dams has also

destroyed bottomland forests, submerged farms, obliterated archeological sites, and permanently changed the character of rivers that possessed great natural beauty and rich recreational potential of another sort.

Dams did not, for all the furor during the 1970's, extinguish the snail darter's humble existence. But that episode, and the more recent alarms over nuclear energy, point to the fact that popular excitement over energy and resource problems is intermittent and invariably phrased in simple good/bad terms. Actual energy policy, if policy is to be followed instead of impulse and laissez-faire, means an unrelenting demand for choices among many unsavory alternatives. There is no entirely satisfactory technology for energy production at the present time—none that is cost-effective and safe for people and the environment as well. In many respects, fossil fuels represent the worst of all worlds. Shipping oil produces spills, extracting it from offshore wells produces burnouts and more spills; turning to coal produces the many evils of stripping, and burning fossil fuels in any form produces hydrocarbon and carbon dioxide pollution. Yet the least satisfactory energy sources are the ones the South is richest in, the one which region, nation and world will continue to use most extensively during the foreseeable future. At the least, regional leaders ought to devote every effort to reducing the dependence of the oil states on one product—a product whose value too obviously hangs upon the price structure of a newly chaotic world market.

The most important long-term development currently linked to fossil fuels—the so-called greenhouse effect—is also the most unpredictable, despite the elaboration of computer models which attempt to predict the future course of the world's climate. Yet the effect seems to be a fact and its first serious consequences belong, not to the remote future, but to this generation and the next. How the changes will come upon us is far from clear. The same industrial processes that produce carbon dioxide also liberate particulate matter that blocks out sunlight, and allegations can be found in respectable sources that the Northern Hemisphere is cooling—though all admit that the Southern is becoming warmer. In any event, a continued rise in sea levels seems all but inevitable, and the fact ought to be considered by anyone dealing with the problems raised by coastal settlement and by the closely related questions of storm and flood control.

Indeed, almost all the regional trends impact on the South's long and complex shoreline—the growth of coastal cities, the need for recreation, the consequences of leveeing and channelizing rivers, the dangers to marshlands, and the rising level of the sea. Today sixty percent of all Americans are said to live within fifty miles of salt water. Federal agencies bear many of the problems associated with increasing human settlement upon the world's most transient real estate. But states and localities are drawn in as well, when those who dwell upon sand seek to stabilize their property, bring in power and sewer lines, secure insurance against storm damage, and so forth. Quite different problems assail the South's Oil Coast, the region of offshore development that stretches from Louisiana to Mexico. In many ways the Louisiana coast appears to be the most seriously threatened. Yearly, forty to fifty square miles of marsh are said to be lost. No doubt the rising of the sea would put the marshlands at risk under any circumstances, but the jetties at the passes of the Mississippi River have also had their effect, carrying out to deep water the silt that might otherwise have nourished the marshes. In consequence, lagoons expand, merge, and ultimately break into the Gulf as new embayments where tides, wave-wash, and intermittent storm surges increase erosion still further. The conjunction of oil wells with extensive wildlife preserves along the Louisiana and Texas coasts creates a permanent possibility for future trouble, especially when hurricanes strike. Over much of the southern coast, sound policy solutions to coastal development can at least be imagined—limiting settlement on barrier islands, restraining construction of groins and bulkheads, perhaps (as the Corps of Engineers has tried) the creation of artificial wetlands using spoil dredged elsewhere. But an end to the rapid destruction of the unique natural and human communities of the Louisiana coastal marshlands is not easy to foresee.

Overall, however, a brief survey of the South's environmental situation suggests as many opportunities as problems. It also gives a sense of urgency to this aspect of planning for the region's future. Without careful attention to the natural systems that give sustenance, remove wastes, and supply recreation and charm to human society, the quality of life for the newly born generation of Southerners can hardly be improved—or, for that matter, sustained at its present level. The South is an old, warm, and wet region of largely mediocre soils, of fast-growing forests, and of long, fragile, endangered shorelines. Over the past generation or two, Southerners have made many

adjustments to established habits as they learned to vary their diets, suppress disease, adopt more widely patterns of urban living, transform their agriculture, restore their forests, and protect their wildlife. Changes no less difficult to accept may face them in the immediate future, as a traditionally individualistic people decide whether they can willingly submit to the degree of social control necessary to enable large populations to inhabit what was, for so many generations, a half-empty land. The Sunbelt, like southern societies before it, is passing beyond its settlement phase; its distinctive institutions, the urban and technological life that helps to distinguish it from the past, have taken form. The interaction of the newest with the oldest South, the South of woods and rivers, marshes and savannahs, summer heat and autumn storm, will help to define the meaning of life to those who live there in time to come.

APPENDIX D

THE DECLINE OF SOUTHERN RURAL LIFE

A position paper prepared for the
Commission on the Future of the South
Southern Growth Policies Board

Dr. Pete Daniel
Washington, DC

Until the World War II era, the South had been defined by its rural character. From the settlement of Jamestown to the breakup of the traditional agricultural system beginning in the 1930's, southern farms and small towns were the locus of life, providing sustenance, recreation, churches, and trading centers. The abrupt decline of farms and small towns has brought on a crisis in the southern countryside, for one way of life practically disappeared before a different way had time to root. Is there anything that can be done to save the institutions and values that were incubated in the rural South, or will the transformation become complete, leaving the South undistinguishable from other parts of the country? Does improving the quality of life in the southern countryside depend on erasing the past and seizing the technological rainbow, or in maintaining the best values of the past and carefully weighing the advantages offered by mechanization and science? Is there a balance point where old and new can exist in harmony?

In a larger perspective, southern rural areas share with other parts of the United States, as well as with emerging countries throughout the world, a crisis that is part of the shift from labor-intensive to capital-intensive agriculture. With the end of family farming as it was generally practiced until the post-World War II era, the new structure of mechanized agriculture promises to end an age of farm-based communities and small towns and to substitute larger units of cultivation and machines that replace people. This revolution has almost run its course in many areas of rural America. Indeed, the Office of Technology Assessment recently issued a report, "Technology, Public Policy, and the Changing Structure of American Agriculture," prophesying yet another structure, one based on an even more capital-intensive scenario. "Over the next 15 years," it stressed, "American farmers will be offered an extensive array of new biotechnologies and information technologies that would revolutionize animal and plant production." This is but the latest offer to farmers to forsake traditional husbandry and purchase more expensive tools that are keyed not to farm life but to profits. The irony is, of course, that the more capital-intensive farming becomes, the less farmers are needed and the more threatened family farmers become. Such promises of greater production come at a time when there is already a surplus of production. Do farmers need to weather yet another round of buy-or-die propaganda, or do they need to consolidate their farms and dig in for survival?

The notion of the constantly re-updated farmer began in the years after the Civil War when agricultural scientists offered farmers new ways of fertilizing crops and caring for animals. Experiment stations and later the Federal Extension Service taught farmers, usually those who could invest in new techniques, ways to save labor and produce more bountiful crops and herds. The emphasis on production combined with the depression in the 1920's led to a massive failure of southern farms. The sharecropping system that emerged after the Civil War and that incorporated recently freed blacks and an increasing number of dispossessed whites rose to its zenith in the mid-1930's and then rapidly disappeared. Millions of farmers fled the land to make way for a new structure that utilized federal subsidies, mechanization, and science.

For Southerners this meant a drastic shift from local economies that revolved around small stores, towns, and rural communities to shopping centers, cities, and factory and service jobs. Farmers who were impoverished by a series of unfortunate institutions—sharecropping, high credit prices, a migratory life, and debt—were thrown off the land with few opportunities. Many were poorly educated due to the notorious mediocrity of the educational system, segregation, and discrimination. There is now a large body of people who live in cities and are little if any better off than when living in misery on farms.

The movement of people off the land that accelerated during World War I and continued during the Great Depression and World War II still exists. Those who continued to farm relied increasingly upon federal subsidies and planned production, but over the years many of these farmers have also left the land, especially those who tilled small plots and used family labor. At present the South is facing a drought that threatens to ruin many more farmers.

In essence, southern rural life has undergone a series of crises since the Civil War. Neither the chaos of free enterprise nor the intrusion of the federal government has been able to save farmers from ruin. Indeed, federal policies have often led to dispossession. Many programs of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) are contradictory and wasteful. At the very time that farmers most need direction, credit, and a bold program, the federal government insists that the market dictate agriculture. Presumably farmers will be left to face this crisis with little aid from the

federal government. At no time has the USDA seen farming as a way of life, except perhaps for official consumption, but its policies treat agriculture as a profit-making venture that should be run with businesslike methods.

Southern history since the Civil War has been characterized by the theme of development, perhaps encouraged by the South's resemblance to a Third World country. It was backward technologically, and it was inhabited by poor blacks and whites eager for a job. Many areas of the South subsidized manufacturing as a patriotic duty. Why has farming been neglected by state and local governments while manufacturing has been subsidized? States have allowed the federal government to dictate the structure of agriculture, to move people off the land, to pour large sums of money into the hands of prosperous farmers, and have watched rural communities wither away.

To reiterate, southern history has been shaped by rural culture. Over time the slave culture, sharecropping, yeomen, and family farms have been driving forces behind the southern way of life. Given that much of what grew in this environment was tainted—racism, violence, exploitation, provincialism—there were many institutions that emerged and allowed even poor farmers to survive, to create a way of life, and to maintain a sense of community. Southern music—gospel, blues, and country—evolved in rural areas. Storytelling and later fiction has been a major contribution of rural people. Churches have been at the center of rural communities. The way of life that revolved around these institutions is now threatened, perhaps doomed. What could be done to save the remnants of southern distinctiveness?

Without agriculture, without a host of small farmers, the towns of the rural South will fade away. Cotton gins, tobacco warehouses, rice mills, and other supporting businesses gave employment to many Southerners. Small towns thrived on farmers coming to town. Communities with schools, churches, and gathering places offered a locus for exchanging ideas and money. With the end of segregation and new opportunities the South could have evolved into a society that still held on to its rural traditions and transcended racism and other injustices. Instead, rural areas are decaying, and the population is moving away. Southern life increasingly resembles that in other areas of the country.

Experts claim that there are still too many unproductive farmers on the land, a refrain heard since the 1920's. Survival, according to the USDA, depends upon the use of machines and businesslike management. Yet there are farmers who prosper without technology and with no aid from the federal government. Amish farmers are driven by their religion to continue a way of life that is best preserved through farming. The primary motivation of the Amish is to allow their children to enter farming and thus preserve the simple way of life that has characterized the faithful for centuries. Instead of giving in to modern ways, the Amish use traditional farming techniques, along with carefully chosen machines, and they prosper. Obviously, the Amish have no secrets that are unavailable to other farmers. Ironically, these so-called backward farmers are expanding their holdings, often buying the land of more "modern" farmers who fail.

Would it be possible for southern states to inaugurate programs that concentrated on farming as a way of life that would compete with the notion of constantly updating machines and investing in new technology? Could programs be instituted that encourage people who fled rural areas to return? Could towns that are threatened with failure be subsidized through programs that would lead to revival?

What preserves a sense of worth and allows a person to live comfortably in a community, and what destroys these goals? The answer is not simple. Mechanization, for example, can contribute to the destruction of a rural community but only if it goes beyond the point where a large number of people share its benefits. During the early days of the century through the 1930's, some farmers owned threshing machines and had steam or gasoline tractors. Threshing days were spread around a threshing ring so that community farmers hired the machines and exchanged work or a part of the crop in payment. Such machines actually strengthened the community by bringing people together to work.

Mechanization began to destroy communities when machines became the unshared property of farmers. The modern combine, for example, symbolizes the isolated work of modern agriculture—an airconditioned cab filled with music from a tape player. There is no need for help from neighbors. Many farms have become islands of technology no longer dependent on neighbors or the

community. The implement dealer might be located a county away, and parts, gasoline, and repairs obtained from dealers in a city. The need for neighbors or local merchants has lessened.

Other technological advances have aided farm people. The coming of the automobile did not so much threaten rural life as make it more bearable. Neighbors could extend their visiting patterns, children could go to town, and the isolation of rural life could be eased. Likewise, the radio and electricity made rural people feel more a part of the national culture.

Only when mechanization and consumer goods became so important that they required debt and a change in farm structure did they threaten the rural ways of the South. In many ways, Southerners were beseiged from all sides to become modern. Extension agents explained the latest methods and tools, the radio beckoned with a host of gadgets or necessities, and now TV makes these items not only desirable but imperative. The simple life seemed the bumpkin life, and most families felt the pressure to buy and to change, and in many cases consumer goods eased the burden of rural life. In the end, machines and other items of modern life changed rural values.

Given the changed structure of the rural South, it seems almost futile to discuss preserving values from an older way of life, to think of upgrading living standards, or to plan for the future. Most questions posed about southern living have had to do with the very items that have changed the South so drastically. Mechanized farming ended the need for people, factories moved them to cities, and the old rural communities dried up. Nothing short of a different set of questions could deal with attaining better conditions in the rural South.

At the core of this probing would be the simple question, why do people farm? Do most farmers till the land because it is a way of life that is preferable to living in cities? Do they desire to make money in the traditional sense or to make enough money, like the Amish, to continue their way of life? This set of questions is more intriguing because present-day Amish farmers have carefully chosen the machines that they use and they shun government support. Is their way a key to a new approach, a way to keep farmers on the land? Is their way of thinking unique or is it shared by other Americans?

During the 1930s thousands, perhaps tens of thousands, of people wrote to the government asking about subsistence homesteads, one of the New Deal programs. These letters read like hard luck stories—people forced off the land, beaten down, driven into debt, and finally offered hope for a small plot of land, a few chickens, pigs, and a cow, plus a modicum of independence in their old age. Their hopes were modest, and most did not care to make money; they stressed preserving their dignity. Is this a way to recreate communities? Many people in the thirties thought so. Is a modest rural life preferable to an insecure urban life?

What has been obvious since the 1930s is the inability of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to contribute a great deal to the quality of rural life in the South. By helping the more prosperous white farmers, it neglected blacks and whites who were not able to adopt the latest methods. Indeed, there are few black farmers left in the South. Few programs, experiments, or studies informed small farmers on how to survive. Sharecroppers and tenants, black and white, were considered not worth saving. Has the USDA thought in terms of stabilizing those left on the land? Why is the USDA intent on helping only the most prosperous farmers? Why are USDA programs often contradictory? (The experimentation to grow more and the inability of U.S. farmers to find markets for what they grow, for example.) Why in a time when the present administration argues for less government support has the USDA broken all records in subsidies, and why have these gone to the wealthiest farmers while the poorest cannot even find credit to plant crops?

Obviously, an entirely new approach to agricultural policy and the nature of rural life is imperative. Studies, hearings, and promises are not the answer, or not even the right question. Perhaps states should seize the initiative and demand certain reforms or even set up programs to change the rural landscape. If states and cities of the South were so intent to subsidize industries, then why not support rural life? The first project would be to stabilize those still left on the land. How does one approach this? Can county agents aid small and troubled farmers? Is there another source of credit when the FmHA runs dry? Are there other ways for states to find markets that do not infringe on the USDA's futile efforts in agricultural trade? Are there tax incentives that would help farmers? Are there subsidies or credit arrangements that could aid farmers?

Many farms are owned by professionals and other wealthy people who are seeking tax shelters, while others are held by large corporations that have no contact with local communities. The

structure of agriculture now consists of a small number of very large farms at the top (which produce most of the goods of commercial agriculture), a growing number of part-time farmers at the bottom, and a shrinking number of family farmers in the middle. If family farms and the communities around them are to be saved, then some incentive must be found to reduce corporate holdings and discourage tax-loss farmers. At the same time, there should be some incentive to introduce new farmers to the land. If it is profitable to own a farm in order to lose money and thus shelter taxes, then why not make it profitable to enter farming and make a decent living? Is there any way that states, or a group of states, could alter the tax structure to achieve this goal?

Small farms owned and worked by families will not magically appear, but those that are left will certainly disappear unless some new programs are offered. Small towns cannot prosper without the support of neighboring people, but without farmers (or industrial workers) small towns will fade away also. A drastic change in policy, such as supporting family farmers and encouraging new farmers, could only come about through a radical departure from present policies. Such a departure would be opposed by some farm organizations (that represent larger farmers), by the USDA, and probably by most federal agencies. There are few ways for ordinary Americans to chose a rural way of life; it is a closed shop.

Since southern history was different from that of the nation at large, then why should not southern rural life be different? If federal programs funnel all people into the same structure there will ultimately be only one type of rural existence. On the other hand, if southern states banded together to shift the structure of rural areas into a more traditionally southern pattern, elements of life that have been important could survive. If small farms and towns are worth saving then there should be programs to achieve this goal. Unfortunately, the institutions that could lead to a new policy fail to see the value of small farms. State schools of agriculture teach science and mechanization, experiment stations develop hybrids and chemicals, and federal extension agents aid more prosperous farmers. Very little research is geared to small farmers.

For family farmers, the world is turned upside down. Could states attempt to set things upright? That is the challenge for the future, but it would mean a radical departure from the policies of the past. It would also mean that state programs would have to challenge the federal (and sometimes the state) agricultural apparatus to make farming more democratic. There is no sure way to achieve these goals, but unless people are encouraged to enter farming, unless existing farmers are saved, and unless small towns survive, a way of life that was crucial to the distinctiveness of the South will disappear.

APPENDIX E

COMPETITION FOR LAND IN THE SOUTH

A position paper prepared for the
Commission on the Future of the South
Southern Growth Policies Board

Dr. Robert G. Healy
Senior Associate
The Conservation Foundation
Washington, DC

37

I would like to offer the Commission some thoughts that arise from a study of past and prospective land use in the South, published late last year as *Competition for Land in the American South: Agriculture, Human Settlement, and the Environment* (Washington, D.C.: The Conservation Foundation, 1985).

Probably no other major region of the country has experienced the degree of land use change that has occurred in the South during the period 1936-1986. A traveler, returning almost anywhere in the American South after an absence of 50 years, would hardly recognize the landscape. The modern industry, the interstate highways, and the Sunbelt cities would of course be new and strange to him. But there have been equally dramatic changes in southern agriculture, in forestry, and in patterns of rural settlement that have been far less widely appreciated, even by many Southerners.

These changes have literally revolutionized how land in the South is used. And they have had major impacts, both positive and negative, on the environment.

Perhaps the most dramatic change has been the extent and location of cotton production. Cotton is still a profitable crop in the South, but its total acreage has fallen from 23 million acres on the eve of the Great Depression to fewer than 3 million acres today. Most of the South's present cotton growing is concentrated in a narrow band within 100 miles of the Mississippi River, and cultivation of cotton is all but abandoned in hundreds of counties stretching across the South from Virginia to East Texas.

In many places where cotton was once king, it has been replaced by the soybean, a crop that as recently as the 1930s was regarded as an agricultural curiosity, used mainly as a forage crop for grazing. Soybeans are now the South's most widely grown crop, planted on more acres than cotton at its height.

Agriculture in the South is now more like agriculture in the country as a whole than at any time in American history. By acreage, the South's principal crops today are soybeans, corn, wheat and hay. These are also the four principal crops for the nation as a whole.

Over the past 50 years, there has also been a depopulation of the rural South, when millions of sharecroppers and their families left the farm to find a better life in northern or southern cities. But during the last dozen years, the rural South began to grow again, gaining new migrants and keeping many of the rural young people who earlier would have moved away. But this has not been due to an increase in the farm population—most of the South's rural people work in factories or offices. Today, only one out of 39 southerners lives on a farm, and even within *rural* areas the proportion is only 1 in 15.

Associated with the mechanization of farming and the switch from cotton to soybeans and other crops has been a geographic reorganization of agriculture within the South—millions of acres of hilly, erosion-prone land abandoned in the Piedmont and Upland South, and millions of acres of new land put into production in the Delta and in the Coastal Plain.

Much of the cropland abandoned in this process of change is now grown up in trees and the new forests have helped make the South the most important timber-producing region in the U.S., eclipsing the Pacific Northwest, and with the margin of production expected to expand steadily over the next 50 years. One of the South's principal products, Kraft paper from southern pine and southern pine plywood, did not even exist 50 years ago. And the expansion of uses for southern pine has attracted most of the large national timber companies to the South, where they've established millions of acres of pine plantations. This really marks a maturing of American forestry, from its traditional hunter-gatherer phase, when wood production meant harvesting naturally provided trees, to a more agricultural phase, when forestry means growing trees deliberately, as a crop.

In addition to contributing to the South's timber production, the reforestation of the region that has occurred since the Great Depression, whether in the form of planted pines or trees growing up in abandoned cotton fields, has covered up many of the scars of the severe soil erosion that so long plagued the South. Gullies big enough to swallow a tractor are hardly noticeable in the woods now, and abundant groundcover conceals, in many places, a total absence of topsoil.

One feature of the southern landscape of 50 years ago that has diminished drastically is the great bottomland hardwood forest that once extended for miles on both sides of the Mississippi River and its many tributaries. Filled with deer and waterfowl, and not heavily logged until the early 20th century, the bottomland forest fell victim to high soybean demand and new land clearing

technologies. Of an original 24 million acres of bottomland hardwood forests in the Mississippi Valley, only 5 million are still left. Most of the forest is now soybean or rice fields, and as you drive through this perfectly flat agricultural country you think you are in the Midwest and might never realize that only a few years ago it was dense forest.

In my study, I looked at fifty years of past land use change in the South—but I also tried to look thirty years into the future. (I chose 30 years because it represents one cycle of planting and harvesting a southern pine tree.)

As I considered the land use future of the South, one of the most remarkable things I discovered is the degree to which land use in the South is likely to be influenced by forces originating in other parts of the country, or even outside the borders of the United States. For example, much of the South's soybean production is exported, and the single most important determinant of the future amount of agricultural land in the South is the future international demand for soybeans. This depends on the rate of growth of foreign economies, on how the dollar fares relative to other currencies, and on the ability of Third World countries to sell manufactured goods in the U.S. so as to earn the foreign exchange needed to buy Georgia or Arkansas soybeans. It also depends on the extent of competition by foreign soybean producers, notably Brazil.

The South's agricultural prospects also depend on competition from elsewhere in the U.S. From the land quantity standpoint, the South is well-endowed—for each acre of land now in crops, it has 7/10 of an acre of so-called potential cropland—land that could relatively easily be put into crop production. The Midwest, its major competitor, has only 2/10 of an acre of potential cropland for each acre now cropped. But the South's productivity per acre is relatively low. There is a need to develop new cropping systems that allow the South to overcome its inherent weaknesses (namely infertile soils, a tendency to drought, and severe pest problems) and to take advantage of its strengths (namely long growing seasons, that make possible double-cropping, and generally abundant surface and ground water for irrigation).

Water can be very important to the future of the South, because western farmers and cattle producers competing with the South are likely to face increasing constraints on their water usage in the future. California cotton and Kansas sorghum may be more productive than their southern counterparts, but the difference depends on the ability of western producers to secure irrigation water.

Southern forestry, too, is very much affected by forces outside the South. For example, the South is likely to gain market share as the naturally-provided old-growth timber of the Pacific Northwest becomes depleted. But the federal government still owns a huge stock of old-growth in western national forest. If Congress and the President ever decide to greatly accelerate the harvest of that timber, or to open western wilderness areas to cutting, the South's forest products industry would face decades of new competition.

Wood exports are also a potential source of growth for the South's forest industry, which now exports only 6.7 percent of its output. But there, too, is the specter of competition from abroad. In the short run, the competition is from Canada—Georgia is the most important softwood timber-producing state in the South, but last year half of the softwood lumber consumed in Georgia came from Canada. In the long run, the greatest competition is likely to come from plantation forests in Latin America.

The South has been increasing its share of the beef cattle industry over the past several decades—some of the old cotton fields became pasture, not forests. Here one of the great unknowns is future change in the American diet. Will we eat more hamburger, and less steak? If so, the South gains an advantage, because the region is specialized in producing grass-fed animals, rather than the grain-fed beef cattle whose carcasses grade choice or prime. Will we eat more chicken, and less beef? Here, too, the South would gain because three-quarters of the chickens raised in the U.S., some 3 billion annually, come from the South. Will we decide that fish is good for our hearts? If so, we might see even greater expansion of aquaculture, a major industry in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

In the cattle industry, as with crops and forest products, foreign competition is always a concern. The South can produce grass-fed beef, but so can Central and South American cattle raisers. In our increasingly interdependent world, the number of cattle in Georgia and Florida may

depend on how rapidly Brazil or Costa Rica allow their tropical forests to be turned into cattle pastures.

Thus far, I have been talking about the future of the economic uses of southern land. But what is the prospect for some other important attributes of land that don't compete in economic markets. One might call these "unpriced values"—they are things that have worth, but that don't have market prices. Among them are water (both in terms of water quantity and water quality), wildlife habitat, recreational opportunity, and the scenic quality of the South's rural landscape. As economic land uses in the South's rural areas continue to grow and change, these values tend to be diminished.

Three unpriced values seem particularly threatened in the South today. One is the South's freshwater wetlands. These may be hardwood bottomlands along the Mississippi or the Atchafalaya; pocosin wetlands in North or South Carolina, or river corridors in Georgia or Florida. When the rural South was settled, the early farmers passed these areas over—they were just too hard to drain and clear with manpower and mulepower. So they still stand as undeveloped islands in an overwhelmingly human-influenced landscape. Now, with draglines and Caterpillar tractors, farmers or the forest industry can move into these areas whenever the price of soybeans or lumber is high enough to justify the expense. Over the last 10 years, the southern states have made great progress in protecting their coastal saltwater wetlands from recreational and industrial development. But the freshwater wetlands have very little protection; in many cases they are destroyed and no one even notices.

A second important unpriced value is the South's underground water. In several areas in the South, the pumping of groundwater for irrigation or for municipal or industrial use has caused water tables to fall by dozens, even hundreds, of feet. This has occurred in the rice-growing area of eastern Arkansas, in the Dougherty Plain in southwest Georgia, around Charleston, and in central and western Florida. Unlike the West, where much of the groundwater is fossil water that is permanently dried up by pumping, the South's groundwater is constantly replenished by rainfall and infiltration. But the southern states are just starting to feel the need to protect recharge areas from development, and to set up systems of water rights that encourage water conservation and equitably distribute the burden of drought. There is plenty of water in the South, and it gives the South some advantages over competing regions, but there is not enough water to waste.

Groundwater quality is even more important than groundwater quantity. And here the relation of agricultural change to environmental quality is very apparent. The South is a very heavy user of pesticides—it has 14 percent of the nation's cropland, but 43 percent of the insecticides applied and 22 percent of the herbicides. Much of the land on which these chemicals are applied is sandy, and water and chemical contaminants move readily into groundwater. And in most southern states, including such major agricultural states as Florida and Mississippi, more than half the population depends on groundwater for drinking water.

You may remember the EDB scare in Florida in 1983-84, when a dangerous agriculture chemical was found to contaminate the drinking water of 50,000 people. Florida is now spending $2 million per year to test groundwater for EDB and other chemicals. Other southern states, where agricultural chemical use is also high, should be doing the same. It's very expensive, perhaps several hundred dollars to test a single well, but it seems to be worthwhile, both in terms of the dangers to human health and the fact that once contaminated, an aquifer may be impossible to ever clean up.

A third unpriced value is the visual quality of the landscape in the rural South. The attractiveness of the South's rural areas and its small towns is, I think, a very important part of the region's quality of life. Many of the landscape features that make the rural South distinctive are fast disappearing, partly as a consequence of economic change (the cotton gins and old-style tobacco drying barns), partly as a consequence of changes in taste (replacement of traditional farmhouses with brick ramblers that would be as much at home in New Jersey as in Alabama).

I think that a major public education and consciousness-raising effort is needed to get ordinary people across the South more interested in their "built environment," both at the scale of individual buildings and of entire landscapes. This effort should enlist state and local governments, philanthropic organizations, environmental organizations, schools and colleges, and museums. There should also be more inventories of valued features of the rural landscape, including human-modi-

fied landscapes. And there is a great deal of scope for creating a new southern architectural tradition that would borrow themes from the South's past in building new institutional, commercial and residential structures. The built environment of the South certainly cannot—and should not—remain static. But I believe that important landscape values are being destroyed simply because people take them for granted.

I could talk about many other unpriced values: sedimentation in streams that come off farms and construction sites and costs millions of dollars annually to clean up; diminishing wildlife habitat; semi-urban sprawl that is spreading over the South's rural landscape.

But I would like to make one closing comment. During the first half of the 1980's, American agriculture went from a a period of tight supplies (in 1981 the amount of land cultivated for crops nationally was the highest in history) to a period of overproduction and low income for farmers, compounded now for southern farmers by a ruinous drought. I believe that in planning for the future of the South, we might best concentrate not on the financial hard times of the present, nor the boom time of a few years ago, but on the long-range prospects for southern land.

I have a son who is five years old. We tend to think of long-range planning as planning for the year 2000. But it is sobering to think that even at the current average life expectancy, my son and others of his generation will spend more than half their lives after the year 2015. We talk about planning for future generations in the South, and in the country as a whole. But we need to take a long view to protect the interests not of some hypothetical future generations, but of the generation that is being born today. I've outlined some of the changes that have over the last 50 years literally revolutionized land use in the rural South. The prospect of future change impels us, I think, to take a profoundly conservative attitude toward our rural land, trying to identify what is truly important, what we truly value, so that we can keep what we want, even as we allow an expanding economy and changing technology to carry us on to new, and probably more intense, rural land uses.

APPENDIX F

THE SOUTH'S NATURAL HERITAGE

A position paper prepared for the
Commission on the Future of the South
Southern Growth Policies Board

Mr. Joe Jacob
The Nature Conservancy
Southeast Regional Office
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

The Southeast is blessed with an extremely rich natural heritage. However, that is changing, and with it the quality of life we have taken for granted is changing. Pressures are mounting to expand growth and development. This expansion will permanently alter our natural systems if steps are not taken to plan appropriate conservation activities in concert with growth and development. The potential losses of species and communities now post a major social as well as ecological challenge. As stated by Dr. E.O. Wilson, Harvard University, "The one process that will take millions of years to correct is the loss of species diversity by the destruction of natural habitats. This is the folly our descendents are least likely to forgive us."

The Nature Conservancy is a national, non-profit, conservation organization whose single mission is the preservation of natural areas and the species and communities they protect. The organization is well known for its businesslike operation and its non-confrontational approach to conservation. Since 1980, The Nature Conservancy has protected 656,929 acres in the South valued at $241,214,358. Our cost has averaged approximately 60% of the fair market value. This represents a significant savings to the many federal, state, and local conservation agencies and private organizations with whom we work.

Our protection effort is systematic and has been crafted to bring representative species and communities of the South onto the ark of preservation to assure their survival for the use and benefit of future generations. The keel upon which this systematic effort was laid began with the creation and development of State Natural Heritage Programs; an efficient, cost-effective natural diversity inventory and data management system. The first State Natural Heritage Program was initiated in South Carolina in 1974. Today, 42 states have Natural Heritage Programs in operation, including all southern states except Alabama. In each instance, the state and The Nature Conservancy entered into a contractual partnership during which The Nature Conservancy established an Operations Center, hired, trained and supervised a professional staff of biologists, ecologists and data managers, and in many instances provided private dollars to match with state and federal funding sources.

After the initial contract period, a state absorbs the Natural Heritage Program and continues to enrich the information obtained by the inventory and to make it available to a variety of users. The Nature Conservancy analyzes this information to derive lists of the most critical areas that require direct conservation action. The Natural Heritage Program information is mainly used, however, by state or federal agencies or directly by developers. Since the information is publicly accessible, many developers, planning firms and consultants work directly with it as early as possible in their planning so as to reject unacceptable sites or designs before any significant investment has been made. We conservatively estimate that information from the various State Heritage Natural Programs is used in actual decision-making at least 50,000 to 100,000 times a year. The information saves individuals and institutions a tremendous amount of time and money and it prevents innumerable unnecessary conflicts that would have arisen from ignorance, doubt, or delayed guidance.

State Natural Heritage Programs could use additional funding to expand their level of service to users. The Maryland Natural Heritage Program, for example, is currently reviewing over 2,000 proposed projects a year for potential ecological damage and this effort alone is consuming the full energies of half the staff. In some states the review functions and data requests are growing so large that without additional staff and resources they threaten to bring the continuing inventory and information update work to a standstill.

Collectively, these State Natural Heritage Programs constitute an on-going biological and ecological survey of the entire United States. Because they all use standardized terminology, file structures, field forms, computer formats and information management methodology, information can be readily exchanged for multi-state, regional or national assessments of various sorts.

The Nature Conservancy believes that the Commission on the Future of the South should recommend that several steps be taken to promote, encourage, and preserve these Natural Heritage Programs in order to ensure that they continue to provide our region with the ability to select the best natural areas for preservation and to avoid unnecessary conflicts between planned development and planned conservation. More specifically we offer the following:

- Encourage the public/private relationships that have been developing between The Nature Conservancy and State Natural Heritage Programs.

- Recognize the State Natural Heritage Program data network as the best natural biological and ecological survey and call on Congress and state legislatures to provide support, recognition, and funding.
- Suggest to all state and federal environmental, wildlife and natural resource agencies that they cooperate with State Natural Heritage Programs by using the data and services and by adding pertinent information through their work.

There are estimated to be more than 2,000 species and natural communities in the South that are critically endangered, threatened or rare throughout all or a significant portion of their range. Approximately 15 percent of these species and communities can be considered adequately protected. To complete the job of protecting the rest will require the conservation of over 6,000 sites.

Approximately 35 percent of these rare and endangered species and communities are on public land and will only be protected if the government owners protect them and keep them in a protected status. The remaining species and communities need to be protected on privately owned land, and a great majority will need protection through some form of land acquisition. Considering the mix of public and private action and high- and low-cost conservation tools, it is our best guess that to protect the remaining rare and endangered species and communities in the South will cost at least $1 billion. Even this estimate is low since it does not include the cost of protecting elements that are rare and endangered only at the state level.

Inextricably linked to moving these species into a protective status is our responsibility to maintain their health and well-being. Based on preliminary statistics developed from data on our preserves, we estimate that 30 to 40 percent of the species and communities will need some kind of active management to survive. In addition to gaining knowledge as to what to do, the public and private owners will need the human and monetary resources to implement management. Our experience has shown that, conservatively, at least 20 percent of the dollars needed for protection will be required for management.

Many states in the South are appropriating funds for the acquisition of land for hunting and fishing, parks, ecosystem protection, and the protection of rare and endangered species and communities. Many of the states within the region, however, are facing potential deficits, so it has become necessary to develop innovative funding sources. Florida, South Carolina and Tennessee are using the transfer tax (also known as a mortgage registration tax or documentary stamp tax) as an excellent resource for funding natural area acquisition. The transfer tax has many advantages:

- It logically applies that when land or property is sold, often for development, that transaction should provide revenue for preservation of the land resource.
- It is nearly invisible to the average tax payer, an insignificant portion of the total costs of such transactions for the average citizen.
- Exemptions can be easily built in to reflect social, economic or political considerations. Current laws generally exempt transactions with other governments, gifts, family transfers, even cemetery lots.
- It generates sufficient funds for a land acquisition program on a perpetual basis.

Mississippi and several Midwestern and Northeastern states have sold bonds in order to finance the acquisition of natural areas. Florida is using a severance tax on the mining of unrenewable resources to purchase conservation and recreation lands. Connecticut, Indiana and Minnesota have passed legislation that provides a framework for the state to match contributions from private sources like The Nature Conservancy, another example of a public/private relationship where resources are pooled to get the job done.

The Commission on the Future of the South can play a significant role in the protection of natural areas while promoting continued economic growth. We recommend that the Commission:

- Encourage states to utilize The Nature Conservancy's experience and expertise in the acquisition of significant natural areas.
- Recommend that each state explore new and creative ways of generating funds for land acquisition.
- Suggest the establishment of "land acquisition funds" for the protection of significant natural areas in each state.

APPENDIX G

THE CLIMATE OF THE ARTS IN THE SOUTH
FORECAST: 1986-1992

A position paper prepared for the
Commission on the Future of the South
Southern Growth Policies Board

Ms. Sharon Donohue
Executive Director
Southern Arts Federation

A relatively new phenomenon in the arts is the economic impact study, which local and state advocates find a useful tool for encouraging increased legislative support for the arts. The data compiled leaves no doubt that the arts constitute a viable force in industry, employer, and consumer marketing. What is sometimes called into question, however, is whether or not the arts really stimulate economic activity or merely recirculate existing dollars within the community.

The Sunbelt boom dispels this doubt and underscores the symbiotic relationship between business and the arts. A favorable business climate and cheap labor may have been primary incentives to business relocation or expansion to this region, but capital investment has extended much further than the obvious statistics of bricks and mortar construction, employment opportunities, products, and services. New corporate citizens in the South have joined with the "home grown" industry in supporting the arts in a big way, demonstrating in hard dollars and sense the role arts can play in "enlightened" economic development.

There are several reasons for this surge of activity. Foremost, but least measurable, is commitment to the community in which the headquarters or plant is located, where "quality of life" is vitally important to employers and employees. Another equally significant factor is the national trend of marketing the corporate image through support of the arts. Unlike charitable giving, which is indisputably important, albeit altruistic, contributions to the arts are often seen quite rightly as good return on the corporate marketing dollar. Another by-product of the investment in the arts is community revitalization, since arts organizations are typically found on the "Main Street."

Examples abound. Perhaps Alabama's Blount Construction Company should be renamed Medici of Montgomery, thanks to its multi-million dollar outlay to provide a facility for the Alabama Shakespeare Festival (ASF). ASF will draw thousands of people (and their dollars) from throughout the region to its summer and winter play season, while giving the home folks a new experience in "masterpiece" theatre. The facility itself is a tourist attraction with all the adornments of Elizabethan splendor, complete with formal gardens and a replica of Shakespeare's home at Stratford-on-Avon.

Atlanta's midtown area around 14th and Peachtree was classified as a "hippie" district in the '60's and early '70's. Its rebirth can be attributable to many factors, not the least of which is the Woodruff Arts Center comprising the Atlanta Symphony, Alliance Theatre, Atlanta College of Art, and the adjoining High Museum of Art. In just the last few years, million of dollars in real estate development have rejuvenated this quarter mile of Peachtree.

In addition to the neighboring IBM towers and AT&T complex, the new BellSouth headquarters is being built a block further south and will include a performance and administrative facility for Atlanta's veteran professional acting company, the Academy Theatre. Meanwhile, the city's downtown area has been enlivened by the new presence of Georgia Pacific. Its corporate headquarters house both a 250 seat auditorium and three-story space for the High Museum of Art's downtown satellite. Georgia Pacific's involvement in the cultural activities has had a tremendous impact on the arts and on the ambiance of Atlanta's downtown business and convention district.

The fact that downtown Louisville is a pedestrian's delight and mecca for the arts consumer is attributable in large part to the leadership of the Humana Corporation. Among its many contributions to the vitality of the city is the Humana New Play Festival, which annually attracts hundreds of theatre-goers, bringing thousands of dollars in new revenue for the arts and the tourist industry. Of equal importance, the arts lend year-round grace and prestige to the downtown community and "export" Louisville's positive and progressive image.

Nissan Motor Manufacturing Corporation USA has delivered more than cars and jobs to the regional prosperity. Even before the first truck was driven off the assembly line, Nissan's giant presence in the South was felt by its generosity to the non-profit sector. The awesome size of Nissan's physical plant—3.4 million square feet—is matched only by the extraordinary $1.5 million in contributions since its site selection in Smyrna, Tennessee was announced in 1981.

Without question, the arts have been a chief beneficiary of corporate largesse in the South. But it should be apparent that the arts have reciprocated by adding a new dimension to positive image-building for corporate sponsor and community alike. Together, the arts and the business sectors become synergistic linkages to the community, and, by extension, the marketability of the region as a whole.

Meanwhile, the public sector has been a highly visible partner in the regional arts enterprise. Overall state legislative support for the arts, generally channeled through state arts agencies, has risen from $3 million in 1974 towards a record of $40 million in 1984 in the region comprising the Southern Growth Policies Board. It can be no coincidence that some of the most successful state contenders in economic development can also boast the strongest public sector support for the arts.

The Southern Growth Policies Board itself provided vision and stimulus to overall regional arts development by founding the Southern Arts Federation (SAF) in 1975 to "assist in furthering the cultural development of the region." In its decade of service, SAF has fulfilled its mandate to make the arts more accessible by providing quality arts touring programs "across state lines," bringing more than 400 arts events to over 1,000 communities in SAF's nine state region—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

The new wave of interstate banking has done more than exchange dollars across state lines. Knowing that arts pay good dividends in its home state, NCNB sponsored the North Carolina Opera's recent tour in Florida, demonstrating to new banking customers in the Sunshine State that NCNB's commitment to quality extends to more than banking services. Also in Florida, Southeast Banking Corporation Foundation has fostered not only the development of individual arts organizations, but has also undertaken a major leadership role in long range planning for the cultural development of its home state. In partnership with the Rockefeller Foundation and the Florida Department of State, SE Banking Corporation sponsored the Florida Cultural Trends Conference in 1985. National, regional, and state leaders gathered in Miami to provide a cross-cutting perspective on Florida's cultural environment into the 1990's.

No matter who is counting or how it is calculated, it should be abundantly apparent that the arts in the South have buttressed its economic infrastructure. The flex of arts muscle in the last decade has been fueled to a great degree by the region's economic energies. Paralleling the regional growth statistics which show stronger economic growth in metropolitan areas than in rural areas, the predominant support for the arts has accrued to the region's major arts institutions—the dance companies, symphonies, museums, theatres and performing arts centers—located in the urban areas. These institutions are, in fact, often as closely identified with their community's spirit as its major league sports team ... who thinks of Charleston without thinking of Spoleto or New Orleans without jazz?

Just as the recent arts development in the South is a by-product of the distribution of wealth to metropolitan areas, so is the future of the arts tied to the South's economically underserved geographic areas. An interesting question raised in the first report on the Commission of the Future of the South in 1974 holds an even greater challenge today for both regional arts and economic development: "How ... do we manage growth and at the same time the quality of life ... that we consider vital to southern culture?" For all its merits, the rapid urbanization of the South threatens not only the economic livelihood of non-metro areas, but also the rich artistic pluralism which originated in those uniquely southern rural and minority communities—the crafts, the blues, jazz, gospel, cajun, and bluegrass music—all that give definition to the traditional "Southern Culture."

Twelve years ago, the first Commission on the Future of the South stated that "the South is unique in its opportunity to preserve and promote native regional arts and crafts, while at the same time developing appreciation and availability of our more universal cultural heritage." It is safe to say that it is "this universal cultural heritage" which has been so far the most visible beneficiary of economic development in the Sunbelt. The predominant support of the arts has been channeled into the region's major arts institutions, for the most part the caretakers of "western culture." While it is essential that these institutions continue to flourish, it is incumbent on regional leadership to turn its attention to the preservation and perpetuation of the other essential wellspring of southern cultural development—the native regional arts and crafts. These art forms—currently on the "critical list"—are reflective of the same economic and population concerns which are keys to the future well-being of the region as a whole, i.e. those concerns regarding the future of the South's rural and minority communities (which are often one and the same). Their livelihood is essential to the region's continued cultural development, since these communities are both the creators and custodians of some of the South's richest and most colorful artistic expressions.

There is already a movement underway to address these concerns and it has created an unprecedented partnership, unique to the region and to the nation: The Southern Arts Federation, working in close cooperation with the Southern Legislative Conference and the Southern Governors' Association, will undertake a major initiative designed to strengthen, stabilize and promote the South's historic artistic treasures and most promising contemporary arts forms derived from the "southern experience." Of particular emphasis will be assistance to the rural and ethnic communities, which together comprise approximately 40 percent of the region's population. The underpinnings of this initiative will be a long-term developmental assistance program, extending over 3 years.

A by-product of this initiative will be an improved regional capacity to deliver arts to audiences generally removed from the cultural mainstream. This accessibility is of particular importance in regions like the South, which are quilted with rural areas.

The objectives of this initiative are five-fold:

1) To preserve and nurture the art forms unique to the region, such as blues, jazz and southern folk life;
2) To strengthen the capacity of arts delivery in rural areas and to stimulate grassroots audience development;
3) To develop and to provide an institutional base for contemporary art forms which are emerging from the South's minority-based organizations, such as black theatre and dance companies;
4) To enlarge and enrich the South's arts touring circuit;
5) To create new partnerships of regional organizations bound by self-interest in the quality of life as a key factor in regional growth.

The planning of this initiative has already demonstrated its catalytic effect on forging new coalitions of regional resources. Guidance and support has come from such diverse organizations as the National Conference of Black Mayors, the Southern Regional Council, the Southern Rural Development Center and, of course, the member state arts agencies of the Southern Arts Federation. In addition, the leadership and vision of the Chattanooga-based Lyndhurst Foundation has provided momentum to the initiative which extends beyond its sizeable funding commitment of $270,890 over 3 years. It is anticipated that other in- and out-of-region foundations and corporations will invest with Lyndhurst in this thrust to develop underserved regional arts. Already, the public sector has come forward with another $150,000, shared equally between SAF member state arts agencies and the National Endowment for the Arts, the nation's federal funding agency.

The support for the regional initiative has demonstrated that the integrity and dignity of the South's rural areas are a cross-cutting issue which concerns leaders in arts, education, government, tourism, and other vital areas of economic development. There is an intrinsic relationship between the South's history of rich artistic pluralism and the stability of the population and employment bases in the rural areas. The safeguarding of the economic base in non-metro counties will have the residual effect of sustaining some of the most important elements of southern cultural diversity. At the same time, the major regional initiative which will be carried out between 1987-1990 will be pro-active in its plan to preserve and perpetuate those art forms rooted in southern expression.

The same progressive attitudes which have steered the economic and cultural development over the last decade hold true for the advancement of the arts into the 1990's. Through a commonly-held vision, unified leadership, and shared resources, the region can continue to develop and integrate the arts into the larger structure of the South's growth and influence.

APPENDIX H

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY IN THE SOUTH

A position statement prepared for the
Commission on the Future of the South
Southern Growth Policies Board

Mr. C. H. Dean, Jr.
Chairman
Tennessee Valley Authority

INTRODUCTION

In previous reports of the Commission on the Future of the South, a commitment to environmental protection and improvement was very clear. In its 1980 report, the Commission stated "... the region's water resources are among its chief assets. Many believe that, in the long run, water will prove to be more important to the region's future than good climate and abundant energy reserves. The southern states, individually and collectively, should place *urgent* (emphasis added) priority on the development of reasonable riparian laws and on water policies which preserve the quality and the potential of this unique, but vulnerable asset. Both salt and fresh water offer opportunities for increased food and hydroelectric production, *if they are properly developed and protected* (emphasis added); recreational and aesthetic values are no less important." In that same report in a *Note to Future Commissioners*, it was pointed out that further study and reflection by citizens and leaders of the region should consider in part environmental issues, including conservation and land-use as well as water resources.

In the August 1984 *Report of the Committee on Southern Trends*, it was recognized on page 27 that, "... the projected rapid growth of the southern economy will bring many benefits to the region. Growth, however, also increases long-term pressures on the environment, as well as industries dependent on natural resources. The quality of surface and coastal waters, especially significant in southern states, is one of the chief concerns raised by growth. The challenge facing the South is to protect this abundance and to maintain and improve the quality of its water."

Water is just one environmental issue that could, if not properly handled, place a crippling effect on economic growth. Another critical problem is the proper management of hazardous waste. The Atlanta regional office of the Environmental Protection Agency has raised this to be its number one concern. The reauthorization of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, which places regulatory control over smaller quantities of hazardous waste generated, coupled with increased pressure to find alternatives to land disposal of hazardous waste, exacerbates the issue. Small and middle size industry may be hard pressed to address the regulatory requirements. EPA (Atlanta) has asked TVA to work cooperatively with them in the creation of a forum of all regional interests so that viable solutions can be developed.

TVA offers its assistance in ensuring that the environment receives the emphasis that its importance deserves in the Commission's deliberations. In 1985, TVA produced its first annual report on "Environmental Quality in the Tennessee Valley Region." The report highlights priority environmental issues that, if not adequately addressed, could and possibly will threaten sustained economic development of the region. A summary of the report follows.

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY IN THE TENNESSEE VALLEY REGION—1985

In many respects, the environmental challenges facing TVA and the Valley region parallel those confronting the nation. However, the Valley's distinctive natural resources and socioeconomic characteristics often dictate the relative importance of environmental issues within the region. This assessment focuses on the air, water, land, and waste situation in the 201-county Valley region.

Air Resources

Overall air quality within the Valley is improving. The number of nonattainment areas for criteria pollutants has decreased dramatically since the late 1970's, primarily due to pollutant source compliance with the Clean Air Act. Despite the general improvement in regional air quality with respect to these criteria pollutants, other air quality concerns still face the Valley and the Nation:

- *Carbon Monoxide and Ozone*—Within the Valley's four largest urban areas, transportation-related carbon monoxide and ozone nonattainment problems persist. Ozone problems have also been identified in rural areas of the Valley. Although progress is being made to address problems in the metropolitan areas, the causes and full extent of the ozone problem in the Valley's rural areas are not known.
- *Toxic Air Pollutants*—The disaster in Bhopal, India, and the more recent West Virginia incidents have dramatically increased public awareness of issues involving toxic air pollutants. To

date, however, toxic air pollutants have not been routinely monitored, so there is no information that would describe the Valley situation.

- *Acid Deposition*—The National Academy of Sciences has concluded that acid deposition threatens lakes and streams; harms forests; damages buildings, monuments, and construction materials; and potentially threatens public health. Recent information has shown that these impacts are not confined to the Northeast. There is now evidence that the southern Appalachians and certain areas of the West are also affected by acid deposition.
- *Indoor Air Quality*—There is mounting evidence to suggest that indoor air pollution may be a serious Valley problem. Although more information and analysis is needed, levels of radon, polyorganic matter, formaldehyde, carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxide, and fine particulates have already been found to be higher in some indoor environments than outdoors.
- *Visibility*—U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and TVA studies in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park and in the Blue Ridge and Shenandoah National Parks have attributed visibility problems to particulate sulfates and nitrates. Fossil-fired power plants are a main contributor to these pollutants. EPA recently disapproved numerous state implementation plans because they did not provide visibility protection for Class I areas (primarily national park and wilderness areas).

Water Resources

Water quality continues to be a concern although a Valley-wide assessment would indicate that overall water quality is generally good. Many water bodies in the Valley do not meet the "fishable, swimmable" goals of the Clean Water Act. Continued discharges of point and nonpoint source pollutants degrade the quality of TVA reservoirs and threaten Valley groundwater resources. The major water quality issues facing the Valley include the following:

- *TVA Reservoirs*—In a recent TVA assessment of pollution in its reservoirs, impaired use due to poor water quality was identified in 16 different reservoirs, with causes attributed to sedimentation, urban runoff, toxics contamination, sewage, industrial discharges, and low dissolved oxygen from upstream TVA dam releases. Potential problems, including suspected toxic pollutants and accelerated eutrophication, were also identified in this assessment.
- *TVA Dam Releases*—A 1978 TVA study reported that environmental quality and water use were impaired by releases from 14 TVA dams and adversely affected approximately 300 miles of river. Low dissolved oxygen and a lack of minimum flows cause significant environmental damage and threaten economic development by reducing assimilative capacity for wastewater. Little improvement has been realized in oxygen content of TVA dam releases.
- *Nonpoint Source Pollution*—A preliminary, regional assessment of the impact of nonpoint sources was completed by TVA in 1985. Mining, urban, and agricultural activities were found to be the major contributors. In urban and rural areas alike, nonpoint source pollution remains a serious Valley problem.
- *Groundwater*—Although over 60 percent of Valley residents depend on underground sources for drinking water supplies, only a patchwork of state legislation exists to protect groundwater quality. Documented sources of contamination include wastewater impoundments, improper solid and hazardous waste disposal, oil and gas exploration/production facilities, coal mining, agricultural activities, failing septic tank systems, and urbanization. Only a limited picture of suspected contamination of groundwater in the Valley exists because of limited data and the low priority previously accorded groundwater protection.

Land Resources

Unlike air and water resources, there is no federal legislation to enunciate national land policy or regulate overall land use. Although influenced by a wide variety of federal, state, and local policies, programs, and regulations, decisions affecting Valley and non-Valley land use have remained chiefly the prerogative of individual land owners. Major land issues facing the Valley include the following:

- *Soil Erosion*—Especially in the agricultural areas of the region, erosion remains a significant problem. Despite continuing conservation efforts (e.g., conservation tillage), 51 percent of the

region's cropland is eroding at rates greater than soil loss tolerance, and 33 percent is eroding at greater than two times tolerance. Conservation measures enacted by the passage of the 1985 Farm Bill could provide a boost for ongoing efforts to reduce Valley soil erosion.

- *Land Reclamation*—There are over 50,000 acres of unreclaimed surface mined areas in the Valley. Abandoned coal and noncoal strip mine areas present the most serious reclamation problem. Only limited progress has been made in reclamation efforts, and the Federal Office of Surface Mining has yet to reestablish an abandoned mine lands program in Tennessee.
- *Prime Farmland*—Based on estimates made in 1967 and 1977, the region could lose up to 170,000 acres of farmland per year to nonagricultural uses. About one third of the loss could be in prime farmland. In 1982, it was estimated that there were over 13.8 million acres of prime farmland in the Valley.

Waste Management

With respect to waste generation, handling, and disposal, the Valley can be viewed as a microcosm of the national situation. Improper solid and hazardous waste management practices of the past pose an unquantified, but potentially significant environmental threat. There has been little change in the types and amounts of waste generated and disposed of in the Valley. Major waste issues facing the Valley include the following:

- *Solid Waste*—Based on 1980 estimates, 8.5 million tons of solid waste are created annually in the Valley. Although approximately 87 percent of Valley counties have access to permitted landfills, some communities are experiencing difficulties in siting new facilities as existing landfills are reaching capacity. In addition, assessment of potential environmental problems has been minimal, and few, if any, landfills have adequate groundwater monitoring systems.
- *Past Disposal Sites*—There are currently 14 sites in the Valley on the EPA Superfund list. However, it has been estimated that there are as many as 1,800 open dumps in Tennessee alone which could potentially contain hazardous waste. Identification and correction of conditions at these past disposal sites will likely continue to be a very long, tedious process.
- *Hazardous Waste*—It is estimated that 8 million tons of hazardous waste are created annually within the region. Many industries dispose of this waste onsite. There are only two commercially available hazardous waste land disposal sites and four commercial hazardous waste incinerators in or adjacent to the Valley. The 1984 amendments to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act contain major changes (e.g., small-quantity generators, land disposal practices, and underground storage of chemicals) which could intensify the hazardous waste issue.

APPENDIX I

ENVIRONMENT AND GROWTH

A position paper prepared for the
Commission on the Future of the South
Southern Growth Policies Board

Mr. James M. Price
Sierra Club
Southeast Representative
Knoxville, Tennessee

The Sierra Club is a citizen's conservation advocacy organization having over 375,000 members nationwide. Within the southern United States served by the Southern Growth Policies Board, our membership exceeds 50,000.

The Sierra Club urges the Commission to challenge the state and local governments in the South to take a more active role in seeking to prepare for and manage the unprecedented growth which the South will experience between now and the 21st Century. This should include encouraging types and rates of growth that are sensitive to the natural and cultural heritage of the region and the preferred lifestyles of our people.

As I travel throughout the South, I am concerned because almost everywhere I see the results of policies which could be described as reactive at best and insensitive at worst. In town after town, state after state, we seem to be determined to follow in the footsteps of, and make the same land use and environmental mistakes as our northern neighbors. Many of the policies of the state and local governments in the South designed to protect citizens from environmental pollution; protect the quality of our air, land, waters, and wildlife; as well as energy policies are woefully inadequate. State and local decision makers in many locales are way behind their people in practicing a conservation ethic. As a result, with few exceptions most of the environmental protection provided in our southern states today has come as the result of major national environmental legislation, such as the National Environmental Policy Act, the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, and others.

In 1980, the Council on Environmental Quality, along with the U.S. Departments of Agriculture and Energy and the Environmental Protection Agency, commissioned a poll of the American people regarding their views of the environmental movement. Some 62 percent of the American people reported themselves to be sympathetic toward the movement, with 7 percent reporting themselves to be activists. Only 4 percent said they were unsympathetic. As far as the South is concerned, those general proportions held up. Support for the environmental movement ranged from 64 percent in the mid-Atlantic states to 56 percent in the western South Central states, 54 percent in the South Atlantic states, and 45 percent in the eastern South Central states. Unsympathetic percentages remained in the 4 percent range in all but the western South Central area where they were at 6 percent. That polling information reveals that there is a good level of support for the environmental movement and values throughout the South. That support, I would guess, has probably increased since 1980 with the subsequent appearance of numerous environmental issues ranging from saving the Everglades in Florida to protecting the southern Appalachians from forest damage by acid rain to dealing with hazardous and nuclear waste problems in all the southern states. But it doesn't appear that our public officials in the South are leading on environmental issues—they seem to be lagging behind the people.

To illustrate, in 1983, the Conservation Foundation sought to evaluate the performance of state legislatures throughout America in passing state legislation dealing with pollution abatement and stewardship of natural resources. The results reveal how poorly our southern states ranked in providing environmental protections. The ranking of the states within the jurisdiction of the Commission on the Future of the South of the Southern Growth Policies Board is revealed below, a score of "1" ranking first and "50" ranking last among the states.

ALABAMA	50
ARKANSAS	26
FLORIDA	17
GEORGIA	29 (tied)
KENTUCKY	12
LOUISIANA	43
MISSISSIPPI	48
NORTH CAROLINA	29 (tied)
OKLAHOMA	45
SOUTH CAROLINA	29 (tied)
TENNESSEE	33
VIRGINIA	23

Similar results are demonstrated when one attempts to rank the League of Conservation Voters ratings of southern congressional delegations regarding their votes on environmental issues before the U. S. Congress. The point is that with the possible exception of Florida Governor Graham's "Save our Everglades" program and a few other initiatives aimed at protecting quality of life values, the natural environment and the environmental health of citizens of the South have not as of yet become the state and local priorities that they should. If the South is to develop economically in a healthful manner, growth management and guidance will have to become a more used part of our vocabulary. If we wish to have a healthy economy over the long term, we must ensure that the natural base for that economy is receiving proper stewardship.

How can we go about ensuring that? First of all, we would recommend that the Commission on the Future of the South encourage the state legislatures throughout the South to pass sound environmental legislation and establish credible departments of environmental regulation. The legislatures should be urged to pass strong state environmental impact statement process legislation, enact basic state clean air, water, and toxics protection legislation, pass non-game wildlife funding legislation, develop hazardous waste programs, develop umbrella environmental agencies, provide energy tax breaks for solar and renewable energy technologies, pass scenic river protection legislation, enact endangered species, coastal and wetlands protection legislation, increase dollars for state parks and for noise pollution control, pass power plant siting laws, enact comprehensive land use planning legislation, make environmental protection a stated goal, pass surface mine reclamation legislation with teeth, enact floodplain protection legislation, pass zoning enabling legislation, initiate solid waste programs, and provide agricultural, historic, and archaeological protection programs, to name but a few. Check the record. Our legislatures still have a long way to go.

A second challenge to grasp is how we go about encouraging economic development. Do we still view economic development as synonymous with industrial smokestack chasing on an unselective basis? Do we still, through our decision making processes, fail to recognize that conservationists have an interest and a role to play in determining the amount, character, and location of growth activities in the South? Are we still unable to come to terms with the thought that a limit on growth may be necessary in certain ecologically fragile areas? Have most public decision makers come to terms with such fundamental interrelationships that would allow them to recognize the extent to which we are fouling our nest? They might well follow the example of Florida Governor Bob Graham in his recognition that the water quality—and even the availability of water in such population-stressed areas as Florida's Gold Coast—may depend upon the health of the Kissimmee River/Lake Okeechobee/Everglades hydrologic system. We don't think most of them have, as yet. Growth management education of public decision makers, public administrators, public and private developers, and some planners is critically needed in the South today.

We have a hope that our leaders in the South will recognize that we are currently destroying many of the values that make living here special. We can attain the economic growth that will help us develop ourselves as a people and retain the unique and fragile aspects of our lands, our flora and fauna, and our culture which makes living in the South a special experience. However, the market place will not provide all the answers to this challenge. Fair and equitable parameters within which the market can function have to be established through a government leadership strong enough to rein in those who would ravage the land, exploit worker's health, and consider only profit criteria in development decisions. The American people, including Southerners, are responding overwhelmingly in support of such national environmental legislation as Superfund and acid rain control legislation. That citizen expertise and commitment is also available to our southern states and communities. Government leaders should be encouraged to recognize that conservationists have a stake in and a role to play in planning for how the South will develop and what will need to be conserved in the coming decades.

We will be there. We hope that government leaders will involve conservationists at all levels by appointing them to cabinet-level positions in state government and to decision making bodies such as planning commissions and industrial development boards at the regional and local levels. In any event, we intend to play a part in decisions which affect the natural environment and the health of the citizens of the South.

Sustainers of the Fund for the Future of the South

AT&T
AKZO AMERICA, INC.
ALABAMA POWER COMPANY
ALCOA FOUNDATION
ALUMAX, INC.
AMERICAN CAN COMPANY FOUNDATION
AMSOUTH BANK
ASHLAND OIL FOUNDATION, INC.
BARNETT BANKS OF FLORIDA, INC.
BEAR, STEARNS & COMPANY, INC.
BELL SOUTH
C&P TELEPHONE COMPANY
CAROLINA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY
CENTEL CORPORATION
CITIZENS & SOUTHERN NATIONAL BANK
DREXEL BURNHAM LAMBERT, INC.
DUKE POWER COMPANY
DYNAMET, INC.
E.F. HUTTON & COMPANY, INC.
ETHYL CORPORATION
EXXON COMPANY, U.S.A.
FLORIDA CRUSHED STONE COMPANY
GENERAL ELECTRIC
GEORGIA-PACIFIC CORPORATION
GOLDMAN, SACHS & COMPANY
HUNTON & WILLIAMS
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES
INTERNATIONAL PAPER COMPANY
JEFFERSON PILOT CORPORATION
KNIGHT-RIDDER NEWSPAPERS, INC.
KROGER COMPANY
LANCE, INC.
MCA, INC.
MERRILL LYNCH CAPITAL MARKETS
MORGAN STANLEY & COMPANY, INC .
NCNB CORPORATION
NORTHERN TELECOM
PHILIP D. LEWIS, INC.
POMPANO PARK ASSOCIATES LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS
RJR NABISCO
ROANOKE ELECTRIC STEEL CORPORATION
SAFEWAY CORPORATION
SEABOARD SYSTEM RAILROAD
SMITH-BARNEY, HARRIS UPHAM & COMPANY
SOLITE CORPORATION
SOUTHERN BELL
SOVRAN BANK, N.A.
SUNTRUST BANKS, INC.
TELEX COMPUTER PRODUCTS, INC.
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY
UNION PACIFIC CORPORATION
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS (McCAP PROJECT)
UNITED VIRGINIA BANK
WACHOVIA BANK & TRUST COMPANY, N.A.
WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORPORATION
THE WILLIAMS COMPANIES

The Associate Membership Program

The Associate Membership Program addresses economic challenges in the South by encouraging a partnership between the public and private sectors. Associate members include corporations, non-profit organizations, and educational institutions.

Dues from the Associate Membership Program go into the Fund for the Future of the South, a permanent source of financial support for the Board. The Fund is used to carry out special projects in economic development and other areas crucial to implementing the recommendations of the 1986 Commission on the Future of the South.

For information about the Board and its work, please write: The Southern Growth Policies Board, P.O. Box 12293, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709. Telephone (919) 549-8167.

SGPB Staff

Jesse L. White, Jr.
Executive Director

Stuart A. Rosenfeld
Director of Research and Programs

Carol Conway
Associate Director of Research and Programs

Candice Brisson
Staff Associate for Research and Programs

John Hodges-Copple
Staff Associate for Research and Programs

Susan Levy
Staff Associate for Research and Programs

Chilton Rogers
Staff Associate for Research and Programs
(Southern Technology Council)

Robert Donnan
Staff Associate for Communications

Janet Papke
Administrative Assistant

Elaine Kelly
Accounting Assistant

Vivian Fowler
Administrative Secretary

1986 Commission on the Future of the South

Published Documents

Halfway Home and A Long Way to Go
The Final Report of the 1986 Commission on the Future of the South

The Report of the Committee on Technology and Innovation

The Report of the Committee on Human Resource Development

The Report of the Committee on Government Structure and Fiscal Capacity

Cross-cutting Issue Report No. 1:
Financing Economic Development in the South:
Public Infrastructure and Entrepreneurship

Cross-cutting Issue Report No. 2:
Equity: The Critical Link in Southern Economic Development

Cross-cutting Issue Report No. 3:
Rural Flight/Urban Might:
Economic Development Challenges for the 1990s

Cross-cutting Issue Report No. 4:
International Trends and Policy Implications
for Southern Economic Development

Cross-cutting Issue Report No. 5:
Education, Environment, and Culture:
The Quality of Life in the South

The Southern Growth Policies Board
P.O. Box 12293
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
(919) 549-8167